

The date on which your subscription expires will be found on the label opposite your name.
The paper will be stopped on that day unless previously renewed.

WEEKLY PEOPLE

VOL. XIII, No. 16.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 18, 1903

PRICE TWO CENTS

FREE SPEECH

Though Beaten Down by the Appellate Division of the Court of Appeals Will be Insisted On by the S. L. P.

The case of John E. Wallace, Edmund Lake and Clinton H. Pierce, Socialist Labor Party speakers, who were arrested and fined in Amsterdam, N. Y., came up the end of last month on appeal before the Appellate Division of the Court of Appeals, where the judgment was sustained, Judge Parker dissenting. The decision evades the point, and thereby gives encouragement to law-breaking policemen and constables to suppress the speech that would enlighten the workers and cause them to overthrow the system that is bearing them down.

But that matters not. Should the alleged "guardians of the law" again try to violate it, measures will be adopted in time to enable an appeal to be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States. In the meantime, the two able briefs of Counselor Benjamin Patterson, the attorney for the S. L. P., are worth reading by all. Here they are:

I.
SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

A.
It seems that the argument of the learned District Attorney is to the effect that, although these defendants had a right to make a political speech, they should have desisted when the police told them to, and that the refusal of the speakers to do so was an act which "seriously endangered the public peace."

The police of the City of Amsterdam, or any other city in the State, have no right to suppress free speech in that manner or to destroy the constitutional right of citizens to peaceably assemble and discuss public questions, by imputing to such citizens the disorderly acts of others, over whom they have no control and for whose acts they are not responsible. If the courts uphold such a contention on the part of the police it virtually nullifies the constitution, and makes of us a government of policemen, for policemen, by policemen.

B.
There is no evidence in this case showing any other acts on the part of the defendants than the making of a political speech at a political meeting of the Socialist Labor Party.

It makes no difference what the defendants were charged with, the question is what were they guilty of?

The learned District Attorney in his brief (page 11) states the following:

"The defendants, who were members of the Socialist Labor Party, had a right to hold a meeting at which to advocate the principles of their political faith, equal to that of members of any other party to hold a meeting of like nature. Their privileges were no less in this regard, and their duty to their fellow-men and the public were no less. The unlawful acts with which the defendants were charged did not consist of holding a political meeting and making a political speech thereat. They were charged with annoying and interfering with various persons by offensive and disorderly acts and language, and committing acts which seriously endangered the public peace."

What other act or acts were proved? What disorderly act or language was proved? None whatever. Their only offense was peaceably addressing their fellow citizens in a political campaign. If the police or if any disorderly person or persons disturbed the meeting their offense cannot possibly be ascribed to defendants. Suppose a Republican or Democratic speaker was addressing an audience and a Socialist or Socialist assailed the speaker or any person in the audience, would that be the crime of the speaker?

Counsel for the people further says: "They were charged with annoying and interfering with various persons by offensive and disorderly acts and language and committing acts which 'seriously endangered the public peace,' but what the 'offensive and disorderly acts and language' which 'seriously endangered the public peace' were, counsel for the people fails to point out in his brief."

There is nothing in the evidence to show that any remarks of the defendants tended to inflame the crowd or engender disorder. In fact, the speeches of the defendants were the conventional political

speeches addressed to workmen, and as there is no evidence of what they said in the record, there certainly can be no presumption that they said anything which seriously endangered the public peace.

The facts as to what they did say were entirely within the knowledge of the people, and the fact that the people gave no evidence that the defendants said anything but what might have been said by the judges of this court when they were candidates for their respective offices, must be presumed. The evidence of Officer Frank E. Faulkner is quoted in the brief: "The crowd began to halloo, 'Put them off the box or we will,' so we thought it was time to do something or else there would be trouble."

This is the first time in the legal history of the State of New York that the courts have declared that a person committing no wrong, doing a lawful act within his constitutional right, can be imputed to be a criminal by disorderly and riotous conduct on the part of a mob, because, forsooth, the police sympathize with the mob.

Suppose Mr. Jones, a manufacturer of shoes in the City of Amsterdam, should tell his employees that he will pay them the wages they ask, but demand that they work for him from 9 o'clock in the morning until 8 in the evening, with the usual hours for meals, instead of the conventional hours of 7 a. m. to 6 p. m., and they (the employees) should refuse to accept such hours, and that Mr. Jones should address them on the street in front of his premises, where they are assembled, appealing to their reason by explaining why such arrangements were necessary, and that his employees should threaten his life, then and there throwing missiles at him and act toward him in an unlawful manner, could the police, witnessing these acts, lawfully arrest Mr. Jones instead of his disorderly employees? Could the Special Sessions lawfully convict Mr. Jones under Section 675, of the Penal Code, and the County Court lawfully affirm the conviction? We think not, unless anarchy reigns in our land and the courts are but to echo the expression of each passing mob.

Frequently throughout the brief the learned District Attorney characterizes the acts and language of the defendants as disorderly and offensive, yet there is nothing in the record to show that the acts of the defendants were other than making a political speech or that there was any offensive language whatsoever uttered, unless the statement by the defendants asserting that they had a right there and that they would not stop unless placed under arrest, was offensive language or a disorderly act.

The statements referred to in the brief of the District Attorney appear at folios 140, 151 and 313 of the printed case, and do not contain offensive language.

In its last analysis this is the contention of the people: That if two persons should walk along the street, going or coming from church or any other place, they have the right to do so; but if a policeman should stop them on the street and deny that right, and they should express their opinion that they had that right and refuse to go out in the middle of the street off the sidewalk, or should not do something which the policeman requested them to do—which the policeman had no right to request them to do—they became disorderly persons in thwarting the policeman from depriving them of their constitutional right to come and go from the church to their homes on the public highway, and consequently violated Section 675 of the Code in seriously endangering the public peace by causing a crowd to gather and listen to their criticism of the policeman, and because the crowd were friends of the police and sympathizers with the police and yelled "lock them up."

C.
The question in this case is: Has a candidate for office a right to participate in a peaceable assembly of citizens in a public street or square to discuss public questions?

Has a candidate such a right, or is such right in the discretion of the police officers of the cities of this State or the constables of the respective towns or the mayors of the cities or presidents of the villages or in the discretion of any person or persons or corporation designated by the legislature as the right subject to the will of an unruly and disorderly mob, or the will of any disorderly persons whatsoever; or does this right depend upon the temper or the opinion

of the citizens who may assemble to listen to said speaker or who may approve or disapprove of the views of the candidate or the principles that he maintains? Or spouses, or is the question one subject to regulation by the officers of any town or city, or subject to the permission of any public officer?

In the case at bar there is no evidence showing that any person, officer or official had power to grant permits, or any ordinance prohibiting such act.

IT HAS NEVER BEEN HELD IN THIS OR ANY OTHER STATE THAT MAKING A POLITICAL SPEECH WAS A NUISANCE PER SE.

The objects of political meetings is to reach the masses. The open streets are alone available for large gatherings. No building can contain all those whom the political leaders wish to reach. Hence, from time immemorial the open-air political meeting has been allowed. Street parades are a familiar example of the gathering of crowds in the public streets. The routes of such parades are often lined with people in such numbers that the ordinary traffic is obstructed, not alone by the paraders, but also by the onlookers, who block the sidewalks.

Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, p. 518, thus describes the right of free speech and the only liability which arises therefrom, to-wit:

"The constitutional liberty of speech and of the press, as we understand it, implies a right to freely utter and publish whatever the citizen may please and to be protected against any responsibility for so doing, except so far as such publications, from their blasphemous, obscenity or scandalous character, may be a public offense, or as, by their falsehood and malice, they may injuriously affect the standing, reputation or pecuniary interests of individuals. . . . Liberty of speech implies not only liberty to publish, but complete immunity from legal censure and punishment for the publication, so long as it is not harmful in its character when tested by such standards as the law affords. For these standards we usually look to the common law rules which were in force when the constitutional guaranties were established, and in reference to which they have been adopted."

"The proper use of a street for the passage of a procession or the reasonable celebration of a great public event is not necessarily a nuisance, even though in violation of orders issued by the Mayor or other public functionary."—Wood on Nuisances, third edition, p. 66.

The Mayor or other public functionary, nor the Legislature, could declare the making of a political speech by a candidate for the Supreme Court to be a public nuisance.

Colon v. Lisk, 153 N. Y., p. 197, and cases cited.

"Making a political speech on a public street is not per se a nuisance."

Fairbanks v. Kerr, 70 Penn., St. 86.
The decisions in this case recognize the right of individuals temporarily to obstruct public streets when engaged in lawful occupations or acts, and that no crime or nuisance is thereby committed.

Callahan v. Gilman, 107 N. Y., p. 360, and cases cited.

From time immemorial and ever since the formation of our government parties have held political meetings in the highways and squares of villages and towns and cities throughout the United States and the Colonies. Never before have such meetings been held to be unlawful. They are what is known in law as "usual," and the use by political parties of the public streets and highways are known in law as "usual."

As was said by the Court of Appeals recently in the recent case of Robert v. Powell, 108 N. Y. 411: "The question involved is whether the object complained of is usual, reasonable or necessary in the use of the street by any one." (See cases there cited.)

The people, when desirous of holding a political meeting of the regular constituted parties, recognized as such in the State, to listen to the candidates—their views, opinions and promises—have a right to assemble in the streets and squares for that purpose, and the use of such streets and squares, under the well-settled principles of law, is usual and reasonable.

The defendants have been complained of for alleged violation of Section 675 of the Penal Code, which is headed, "Acts Not Expressly Forbidden." This section is said to be an attempt to cover crimes existing at common law and not otherwise defined in the Penal Code.

By its terms, Section 675 applies only to cases "for which no other punishment is prescribed by this code."

Now, if we look at the other sections of the Penal Code we find that it does provide in express terms for the punishment of certain offenses. For example, Section 385 defines a public nuisance as an act which "annoys, injures or endangers the comfort, repose, health or safety of any considerable number of persons"; or "offends public decency or unlawfully occupies a public park, street or highway, or in obstructs, interferes with or tends to obstruct or render dangerous for passage any way renders a considerable number

of persons insecure in life or the use of property."

Section 387 makes such public nuisance a misdemeanor, and Sections 448, 449, 450 and 451 of the Penal Code define the punishment for disturbing of lawful meetings, and for riots and unlawful assemblies.

Sections 450 and 451 are expressly directed against inciting a meeting to resist the laws of the United States or of the State, or to obstruct any public officer of the national or State governments, or to acts of force and violence, and against meetings with intent to disturb the public peace or tending to a breach of the peace or injury to person or property, and every person participating therein, by his presence, aid or instructions, is declared guilty and punishable.

But these sections are not made the basis of this charge. The information is, therefore, defective in charging a violation of the indefinite omnibus Section 675, which does not specify what acts shall be considered as endangering peace or health or decency.

The contention of the District Attorney that because public speaking draws a large crowd makes it an obstruction of the street, and therefore unlawful, is not tenable. As was said in Callman v. Gilman, 107 N. Y. 367: "It is true necessity justifies actions which would be otherwise unlawful. It is true also that the necessity need not be absolute; it is enough of it be reasonable. No man has a right to throw wood or stones into the street at his pleasure; but, inasmuch as fuel is necessary, a man may throw it in the street for the purpose of having it carried to his house, and it may lay there a reasonable time. So, because building is necessary, stone, bricks, lime, sand and other materials may be placed in the streets, provided it is done in the most convenient manner."

If the streets can be obstructed temporarily when necessary for material purposes, how much stronger is the contention that the streets can temporarily be used for the public welfare, for is not the discussion of public questions by candidates, preceding elections, in public streets for the public welfare?

The Court of Appeals, in Colon v. Lisk, page 197, says: "Equal rights and impartial tribunals to enforce them are the results which are intended to be secured by the establishment of constitutional limitations to legislative power. Under the mere guise of a statute to protect against wrong the legislature cannot arbitrarily strike down private rights and invade personal freedom. The police power must be exercised within its appropriate sphere and by appropriate methods. This power can be exercised only to promote the public good."

As discussion of public questions by public candidates is absolutely necessary for the preservation of republican institutions, it seems absurd to maintain that in the exercises of these functions, duties and rights, a temporary obstruction of the street in so doing is not reasonable.

If, for instance, the police had arrested one of the persons who threw stones at the speaker and yelled "pull him off the box," would he not have been properly arrested for violating Section 448 of the Penal Code?

The only offenders at the meeting were the persons who threw stones and yelled "pull him off the box" and the police, all of whom violated Section 448 of the Penal Code.

The judgment of the court should be reversed and the defendants discharged. Benjamin Patterson, Counsel for Defendants.

II.
SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

The learned District Attorney contends:

First—That an assembly of fifty or seventy persons in a public street, listening to a political speaker at a political meeting, although an orderly gathering, "might easily constitute an improper diversion."

Second—Whether it is or is not an improper diversion, such a gathering was a hindrance to "free and unmolested travel" within the purview of the ordinance.

Third—Notwithstanding complete obstruction was not the result of this orderly gathering of fifty or seventy people, listening to a political speaker, yet it somewhat impeded, checked, or retarded travel, and consequently, even if the defendant had a constitutional right to make a political speech at an orderly political assembly of citizens, it must be exercised in such a way that it will not interfere with the right of the public to the free use of the streets.

A.
The first proposition needs no argument to refute it. It is self-evidently fallacious.

The second is so narrow, technical and erroneous that were it not for the fact that all the officials of the City of Amsterdam seem to think that any conduct toward the suppressing of a minority party is justified and logical, counsel for the appellant would not discuss the same.

It might just as well be contended by the learned District Attorney that a large number of people emerging en

masse from church on Sundays in the City of Amsterdam were violating the ordinance, because they hindered "free and unmolested travel" to those citizens walking along the sidewalk at right angles to the emerging mass of people pouring out of the church. He might just as well argue that the church of people should remain inside of the edifice and pass out one at a time, at such intervals as would not hinder "free and unmolested travel." So, also, would a citizen be violating the ordinance by receiving a ton of coal and having it dumped upon the sidewalk in front of his house, or a load of wood or flour. The right to the use of the street for necessary purposes cannot be construed as a violation of an ordinance prohibiting a "hindrance to free and unmolested travel."

The courts of this State recognize the right of individuals to obstruct public streets when engaged in lawful occupations or acts, and that no crime or nuisance is thereby committed.

Callahan v. Gilman, 107 N. Y. 360.

Robert v. Powell, 108 N. Y. 411.

In Callahan v. Gilman, supra, the court says: "It is true necessity justifies actions which would be otherwise unlawful. It is true also that the necessity need not be absolute; it is enough of it be reasonable. No man has a right to throw wood or stones into the street at his pleasure; but, inasmuch as fuel is necessary, a man may throw it in the street for the purpose of having it carried to his house, and it may lay there a reasonable time. So, because building is necessary, stones, bricks, lime, sand and other materials may be placed in the streets, provided it is done in the most convenient manner."

As discussion of public questions by candidates of regular political parties, or by others, is absolutely necessary for the preservation of republican institutions, it seems absurd to maintain that in the exercise of these functions, duties and rights a temporary obstruction of the street in so doing is not reasonable and at times necessary. Otherwise, one party could hire all the halls in a town—there usually being very few in small cities such as Amsterdam—and thus force the opposite party to hold its political meetings in the street, to be suppressed by the complacent police.

The right of the people peaceably to assemble for lawful purposes existed long before the adoption of the constitution of the United States. In fact, it is and always has been one of the attributes of citizenship under a free government. It derives its source, to use the language of Justice Marshall in Gibbons v. Ogden, 9 Wheat. 211, "from those laws whose authority is acknowledged by civilized man throughout the world." It is found wherever civilization exists.

United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U. S. 542.

C.
In reply to the third proposition, we assert that in exercising the constitutional right of assembling in the street, in holding an orderly political meeting, the public is not deprived of the free use of the streets. If a person cannot pass with the same facility that he is wont to do when no political meeting is held, it is a loss of that degree of comfort which every citizen must lose in a civilized society. It is a surrender for the public good and welfare, and cannot be lawfully considered an annoyance to him with the purview of the ordinance. The annoyance there referred to is one which no citizen is bound to submit to. A citizen—man, woman or child—who must leave the sidewalk in the City of Amsterdam to go out on that part of the highway set aside for horses, etc., because a citizen is having a load of coal dumped on the sidewalk in front of his house, and is taking it into his house, cannot maintain that such a citizen is violating the ordinance and annoys him or her. Neither can such person claim that the lawful assemblage of persons listening to the candidate of a political party before the election, comes under the purview of such ordinance.

The city officials could not pass such an ordinance, neither could the Legislature, and hope to have it enforced by the courts. It would be declared unconstitutional.

Colon v. Lisk, 153 N. Y. 197.

"Under the guise of a statute to protect against wrong the Legislature cannot arbitrarily strike down private rights or invade personal freedom. The police power must be exercised within its appropriate sphere and by appropriate methods. The power can be exercised only to promote the public good."

Colon v. Lisk, supra.

If the streets can be used temporarily when necessary for purposes of material interests, how much stronger is the contention that the streets can temporarily be used for the public welfare, for is not the peaceable assembly of citizens for consultation in respect to public affairs for the public weal? The very idea of government, republican in form, implies such right.

The judgment of the County Court should be reversed and defendant discharged. Benjamin Patterson, Counsel for Defendant.

LABOR'S LESSON

From The South African War—Capital Militarism and Patriotism On Exhibition

In view of several facts transpiring in connection with labor matters in South Africa at present, it will be interesting and profitable to devote a short time to the study of the labor problem in the light of these developments. The whole South African question is a powerful searchlight, exposing the aims and objects of modern capitalism when studied from the standpoint of the class-conscious worker. It bristles all over with object lessons of how capitalism continually bamboozles the workers by appealing to them through the sentiment of patriotism, nationality and imaginary profits and advantages. What is true of the British workman is also true in a large measure of the American, German or French workman also. The methods of capitalists in those various countries in dealing with the working class is also very similar, and therefore when we study this question of British capital and labor in the light of current events connected with the late war, it is with results equally profitable for the workers of other countries.

Capitalism ever veils its purpose behind high-sounding sentiment and fair speeches, noble resolution and promises of great rewards. How well the apostles of capitalism acquitted themselves in this regard in connection with the late South African war is daily being demonstrated.

The avowed purpose and object of the late war was to emancipate the negro population from Dutch slavery, and accord to them the coveted privileges which were obtainable only under British law. To also once and for ever establish freedom and British citizenship, with all electoral privileges therein contained to British and Uitlander alike. No mention was ever made of any design on the part of capitalists to reap any rewards out of the prospective struggle and bloodshed. So far as they were concerned, they were animated only by high national motives, and pure patriotism. The appeals which went forth to all parts of the British dominions spoke only of the presumptuous aggression of Paul Kruger and his Dutch allies, picturing them as the incarnation of barbarous cruelty, tyranny and oppression. Upon these grounds the British Government sought support, and called to Britain's standard every true and loyal son who loved his country and hated such a foe. The response was such as filled each patriotic heart with pride, for, flocking from each city and shire of the motherland came "Duke's sons and Cook's sons" to maintain the noble cause. Imperial hearts were also stirred beyond the seas, and hastening to the battle came legions from Canadian prairies of the north, as well as those who lived beneath the Southern Cross; in thousands strong they gathered to do battle with this cruel, hated foe and enemy of liberty, progress and justice. The strife was long, arduous and bloody, but, as usual, victory rested with the strongest battalions and heaviest purse. The two republics were crushed beneath the iron heel of conquest, and the blessings of British law and justice were bestowed on the oppressed people. It shall be our task to inquire how those blessings are operating, and what they have replaced.

A retrospective view of the question will be profitable in bringing out some of the lessons which should be impressed in connection with this struggle.

From the beginning of the struggle for supremacy between Dutch and English in South Africa, the element of capitalistic oppression, on the one hand, under English protection and Dutch obstinacy and aversions to such methods, on the other, played a considerable part. But wherever capitalism finds favorable fields for its operations conditions must be created suitable to its needs. The medieval methods of the Dutch oligarchy in the republics of the Orange Free State and Transvaal, were not suitable for the exploitation methods of English capitalists, and consequently they must be overturned. The means by which this was accomplished were varied and occupied considerable time. The Transvaal Republic, which was founded in 1854 by malecontents from the adjoining colonies, which were annexed by the British, and would succeed in their own way of life and government if left to themselves. It, however, paid British merchants and traders to supply the natives on their borders plentifully with arms and gunpowder, which kept the republics continually at war with the tribes, which so impoverished and harassed them that their then president

Agents sending in subscriptions without remittance must state distinctly how long they are to run.
Agents are personally charged with and held responsible for unpaid subscriptions sent in by them.

was prevailed upon to hand over his suffering people to the kind protection of the British. In consideration for which he received a handsome pension and quarters at Cape Town for the remainder of his days, paid out of British money. This was in the early days of the republic. The burghers, however, were not agreeable to this barter, and so regained, after some time and trouble, their independence again. But there was too much gold to be mined within the limits of the Republic to enable the authorities to govern the land in peace. The London Stock Exchange could not get a full and satisfactory return out of the mines while they were under Dutch administration. The mine owners were unwilling to be hampered with such restrictions in connection with their labor as the authorities of the republic choose to impose, and they could not consent to a continuance of the Dutch royalty. Under these conditions the mine owners would not consent to enlarge their operations, and enlargement must be entered upon; so the only course left was to set aside Dutch authority and raise the British flag over those possessions. The story of the Jameson raid and what it indicated is still remembered by those who have observed the trend of events in those parts.

Rhodesia, where the full benefits of British freedom was established, lay to the north of the two republics. In this land native labor was cheap, in consequence of the imposition of a hut tax, which all native but owners had to pay under the law. Or, in other words, a system of slavery existed under this method which compelled the natives to labor or be homeless. This general system of serfdom was of great service in procuring a plentiful supply of native labor for the mines of British capitalists in Rhodesia. Such a system was desirable in the Transvaal, but Paul Kruger, the tyrant, would not assent to as profitable as it might be under this British system in Rhodesia. With those facts so well known to the British capitalist, it is small wonder that he waxed patriotic and vowed vengeance on those who stood in his way to wring the coveted gold out of the hide of the negro. In short, war was the only alternative to obtain the capitalistic freedom necessary for success, and war it came to be, the end of which we all know, and now we are to study the result.

Expectations of benefits to the workers, based on the promises of the representatives of capital, are ever doomed to disappointment, and no recent events illustrate the fact more forcibly than those transpiring at the present time in South Africa. Patriotism figured largely in the appeals made to the workers who responded and composed the rank and file of the volunteer forces coming from Great Britain and her colonies, but promises were also held out of reaping much profit in increased wages, more plentiful and constant employment, through the enlarged markets which would be created for manufactured products when triumph was obtained. It was a rich land, and immigration would flow thither, where the immigrant would find a country where he could reap a rich and hasty fortune. It was a land of gold and diamonds, and other sources of riches innumerable. Such were the hazy promises and dreams which were related to the ever-credulous workers, the realization of which is now in evidence; and what are the facts? Let us take the testimony of their own capitalist press:

First, as regards immigration to Africa, it has been discovered to be no land for Europeans in great numbers to settle in. The climate is good, but the soil in many places is not suitable for agriculture, irrigation being necessary in many parts, which is too costly for all that can be obtained for the products obtained. Markets are limited for agricultural and dairy products, except in a few commercial and mining centers. So immigration as foreshadowed not materializing, expanding markets cannot follow—natural result—no increased products are required, and wages remain as formerly or with a downward tendency. Hence the disappointed wail in the capitalist press over South African immigration and colonization.

The lament also expressed in the capitalist press regarding the condition of the labor market in South Africa reveals a source of much disappointment. The war, if successful, was expected to establish British influence in the economic field, which would act, as in other places favorable to the interests of capitalists. (Continued on page six)

THE BUILDING TRADES

Authorized Agents for the People

Recent developments in trade union affairs in New York city more than ever go to prove the correctness of the attitude of the S. L. P. and S. T. & L. A. and the truth of the contention that the exigencies of the process of capitalist development and concentration lead to the using of the pure and simple unions through their corrupt leaders, the "labor lieutenants," as Mark Hanna correctly styled them, by one set of capitalists in their fight against another set who happen to be their competitors.

Another thing proven by the unsavory developments and events of recent date, is the applicability of the S. L. P. criticism of the fraternizing, toadying and cringing on the part of the Social Democratic, alias "Socialist" party members, in their relations with the pure and simple fakirs whom they know to be hopelessly corrupt.

To understand the conditions in the building trades, the progress made in the past four and five years in the methods of conducting that industry must be taken into consideration. The construction of a modern skyscraper or other large building requires the labor of men belonging to more than twenty-five distinct crafts. Up to less than five years ago practically all the building was done on the old-fashioned plan of subletting the various divisions of the work to as many sub-contractors, a structural ironworker for the frame, a mason builder for the mason work, a master carpenter for carpenter work, and so on with painters, plasterers, marble workers, etc. If a general contractor made an attempt to erect a building of any size without dealing with sub-contractors, he found that the middlemen stood in with the unions and the labor fakirs and thus controlled the situation so thoroughly that the general contractor who had the temerity to attempt to ignore them could not secure enough union men to start the job, or if he got started would have so much trouble made for him that he could not proceed with any degree of success. It is related of one such general builder who tried the experiment of hiring all the men of the various trades directly without the intervention of the sub-contractors, in the building of one of the big department stores erected on Sixth avenue in the early nineties, that he was so hampered as to be driven into bankruptcy by the time the job was finished.

So many strikes occurred on the job that the completion of the work was delayed long beyond the time called for in the contract. The control of the union "leaders" by the sub-contractors had put him out of business.

The viciousness of capitalism and the corruption-breeding influences of its competitive warfare is well illustrated by the manner in which the exigencies of the business rivalry between the small contractors themselves led to the corrupting of the pure and simple unions. The latter, of course, founded on false principles, nurtured in ignorance, untrained in any knowledge of class interests or class solidarity, and entrusting the conduct of their affairs to equally ignorant and often vicious "leaders" and walking delegates, were an easy prey. When a general builder sublet the various divisions of his work, this rivalry among the subcontractors naturally led to the cutting down of the estimates in their bids to the lowest possible margin. How, then, was the successful bidder to secure the profits to get which he had gone into the business? One way was to cause the job to be extended by discovering that a lot of "extra" work was to be done, more than had been called for in the contract, out of which profits could be made. To work this game the co-operation of the unions was necessary.

But all this was contrary to the interests of the general contractors, who often suffered through failure to have contractors finished on time. However, they were powerless to help themselves while conditions remained as they were. That they could remain so would be inconsistent with the logical trend of capitalist development, and here is where twentieth century capitalism steps in to supersede the methods and traditions of its nineteenth century predecessor with an up-to-date organization and system applied to the building business, by which it is fast becoming completely revolutionized. Big construction companies, with financial backing running into tens of millions of dollars, were formed with the purpose of placing the industry on a similar footing to that of other great industries. The sheer power of their millions enabled them to sweep away the obstacles which formerly prevented the lone general builder from hiring workmen direct. The biggest and strongest ones soon had their affairs down to the same scientific basis as the regulation trustified industry. Middlemen and outside bosses, whose existence formerly added so much to the cost and length of time of constructing buildings, were almost entirely obliterated, nearly every man on the job except the marble workers, who are still in the hands of separate bosses,

was employed directly by the company, which had its own superintendents and foremen, and not only were all these on the one payroll, but it is well understood by those on the inside that walking delegates and labor fakirs were also placed under the same protecting wing, as soon as the big companies discovered that they were being used by the small contractors to hamper their big competitors. The latter at once proceeded to beat the little fellows at their own game, and presently one of the largest concerns, the George A. Fuller Construction Company, one of the biggest in the country and one that has succeeded to a greater extent than the rest in almost absolutely eliminating the middleman from its contracts, began to boast of its "harmonious relations" with the trade unions. The actions of this big firm during the middle that has existed in the building trades ever since the beginning of the row between the Brotherhood Carpenters and the Amalgamated, against whom the former went on strike in the early spring, are worthy of observation by anyone desirous of correctly understanding the situation.

Here, it may be well to point out that the Fuller concern has ramifications extending to many of the larger cities of the country—Boston, Chicago, Philadelphia, Albany, St. Louis, Washington, Baltimore and Pittsburgh—wherein they have thousands of men at work upon the construction of buildings for which they have secured contracts, which, by the way, are a fruitful source of profits, calculated to more than offset any loss they might sustain through any delays experienced in this city. The majority of their rivals, on the other hand, are merely local firms, and the smaller ones among them find the protracted tie-up a severe strain upon their finances.

When the Brotherhood of Carpenters started its war against the Amalgamated Society, and the real force behind this fight has yet to be revealed, all the construction companies found their work greatly hampered. Both sets of carpenters were union men, and both belonged to the American Federation of Labor; but the leaders of each declared that the other crowd must be annihilated. The result was a mix-up that partially paralyzed the building work of the city. The Amalgamated Society, though numerically smaller than its rival, was affiliated with the United Board of Building Trades, while the Brotherhood was not. This Board, composed of walking delegates of the various unions, declared its intention of standing by the Amalgamated and refusing to recognize the members of the Brotherhood. This, of course, intensified the struggle, and here is where the Fuller Company's "harmonious relations" with the unions served it well. According to the published reports at the time, its jobs were almost the only ones upon which any work was being done, it having expressed its willingness to employ only Amalgamated men supplied by the board. Later, when the carpenter racket had about subsided and the bosses were beginning to feel sure of a continuance of operations, the newly organized teamsters and building material drivers, who had been admitted to the United Board, made demands for better conditions and the recognition of their union. In the forming of these new unions and their admission to the United Board the various bosses scented a new danger from the additional power it lent the board to cause a general tie-up, and the same instinct of self-preservation that formerly kept them apart now prompted the various contractors, as well as lumber and material dealers from whom they received their supplies, to come together for mutual protection. The result was the formation of the Building Trades Employers' Association, composed of representatives of associations of the different trades.

The one notable exception to this move was the George A. Fuller Construction Company. All its rivals, including the big concern known as the Thompson-Starratt Company, were in the bosses' union, and a unit in approving the demand of the Lumber Dealers' Association, that the Board of Building Trades expel and repudiate the drivers, promising to bring the tie-up to an end if the men would work with material hauled by non-union teams.

The tie-up now was caused by the refusal of the Lumber Dealers' Association and the association formed by building material men, the brickyarders, the cement, plaster and lath men, to allow their yards to be unionized. The result was that the two associations locked out their 4,000 employees, and declared that not a stick of timber nor a brick should be supplied to a building in Manhattan and the Bronx. In this they were backed by the national associations. Incidental to this was the strike of nearly 2,000 structure ironworkers because of a fight between unions of engineers, and later it was intensified by the strike and lockouts of inside ironworkers, employees of the iron works of New York and vicinity.

A committee of the United Board of Building Trades agreed to bring the question of withdrawing their support from the "unskilled" team drivers before the board. This was the incident that caused the division of "labor's forces" as represented by the walking delegate

Following this a great display of "solidarity" and readiness to stand by the so-called unskilled men was made by the majority of the delegates of the Board, including as one of their most aggressive members, Sam Parks, of the Housesmiths and Bridgemen, who had formerly been a trusted employe and foreman for the Fuller Company.

The minority of the delegates "accepted" the proposition of the bosses and resented the action of their "brothers" of the supposed solidarity-displaying propensities, declaring they would not stand for being locked out for the sake of a lot of "unskilled" team drivers. This brought about a split board, the minority, representing sixteen "skilled" trades, seceding and forming the Board of Building Mechanics; the majority, representing twenty trades, remaining with the old board, to which it was reported two seceders later returned, mainly, it was said, through the efforts of Parks. The "skilled" seceders agreed to handle material irrespective of who hauled it, and the announcement was made that all the yards would be opened by June 12, and in this connection the following from a news item of June 10 is worthy of note as an illustration of the anarchistic hatred of the working class indulged in by "law and order" upholding capitalists:

"The Labor Committee of the New York Lumber Dealers' Association, whose aggressive action in locking out the drivers really brought the tie-up to an end, was at its headquarters to-day, and announced its intention of staying there until operations were in full swing once more. 'We are not looking for trouble,' said Vice-President James Sherlock Davis; 'but if any comes along, we are going to be on hand for our share.'"

"Are you prepared to meet any attempt at interference?" he was asked.

"We are in close touch with each yard in the association; also with the district attorney's office and with the police. At the first move of any one to check us we will act. We mean to settle this business once and for all, and would like nothing better than to wind the whole matter up with a good, stiff demonstration of the power of the law."

"This did not mend matters much, however, as new complications arose, and the weeks were slipping by with the tie-up still general, except on a number of big buildings being erected by the Fuller Co. While in this plight, the Employers' Association conceived a bold plan, by which they hoped to kill a whole flock of birds with one stone; they would eliminate the walking delegate, remove the necessity of having to "cough up," and establish a system that would be a guarantee against strikes in the future. Their plan lay in exposing the walking delegate and his methods, and appealing to the rank and file to accept their proposition for an arbitration scheme in which the obnoxious business agent would not be a factor.

To this end, with Parks as the scapegoat, they proceeded to file charges of extortion and howl for District Attorney Jerome to do his duty in the matter of exposing the crookedness recognized to be rampant in the labor movement in New York City. A circular was gotten up by the Board of Governors and distributed broadcast to the rank and file of the workmen.

The principle effect this had upon the rank and file of the unions was to further confuse them and put them all at sea. Many of them, not knowing what to think of the whole situation, or how best to act to get out of the middle. This in itself is one of the worst and saddest results of the training or lack of it received by the dupes of pure and simple trades unionism. Ignorant of the underlying causes of the economic development of the age, and thus blind to a great extent to the very existence of such development, or, if they do see it, for the same reasons, unable to understand it, kept continually in this state of mental confusion by the fakirs, who, trading on their ignorance, throw dust in their eyes by telling them to keep politics (working class politics, of course) out of their unions, except when those fakirs are doing the dirty work of the professional politicians by boozing some capitalist candidate as a "friend of labor," at so much per boom; their spirit of resistance, that undeveloped germ of class-consciousness that is latent within them, exploited by the fakir when a strike is necessary to his or his master's interest, the untrained rank and file are knocked about like shuttlecocks between the battledores of competing capitalists and graft-hunting fakirs.

In this connection a vast field opens up before the intelligent, aggressive members of the Socialist Labor Party and Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance, whose very knowledge of the necessity of educating the rest of the workers on correct lines must perform make them see that its tilling is imperative. The spirit of resistance, the latent class-consciousness of the workers, must be aroused but trained in the right direction. The right kind of literature must be put into their hands; the Daily, Weekly and Monthly People, must be spread among them; a

knowledge of correct principles of organization, on political and economic lines, such as are only possessed by the S. L. P. and Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance must be diffused in their ranks and those bodies built up if anything is to be hoped for from them in the way of united action along proper lines.

About the time the howl was going up against what was looked upon as a threatened attempt to force the unions to agree to the arbitration scheme, and confusion of sentiments in relation to the mix-up gave every indication of the tie-up being prolonged, the hoisting engineers declared a strike of their men. As this hampered the work on the Fuller jobs which had been going on all those weeks while their rivals were tied up, it furnished the company with an excuse for joining the general lockout, of course without becoming a member of the bosses' organization.

The news items of June 17 contained the following:

"President S. P. McConnell, of the George A. Fuller Construction Company, which stopped work to-day on all of the big buildings which it has under construction, thereby throwing out of work about ten thousand men, denied to-day that the company had instituted a lock-out as a result of any agreement with the Building Trades Employers' Association, of which it is not a member. Judge McConnell, when seen at the main office of the company, 137 Broadway, to-day said:

"We have never concealed the fact that our sympathies are, with the employers' association, but nevertheless our action in stopping work to-day was not the result of any arbitrary agreement with the members of the association. We stopped work to-day for two good reasons: First, because the engineers were on strike and we couldn't get any hoisting done; second, because several of the building trades organizations have been raising the rates of wages. We believe it will be unprofitable to continue the work at the increased cost of construction which the arbitrary demand for higher wages would entail. I would not venture to say how long our enterprises will remain at a standstill; but in the circumstances it is useless to attempt to continue. No other builders seem able to stem the tide of increased wages and arbitrary demands of walking delegates."

"The executive committee of the George A. Fuller Company consists of the following: James Stillman, Hugh J. Grant, Henry Morgenthau, H. S. Black, S. P. McConnell, Bradish Johnson, Albert Flake and Robert E. Dowling."

Of course this company is willing now to see the walking delegate put out of business if the other fellows can do so through the medium of the arbitration plan, and it is not unlikely it would be willing to see the suspension of work continue indefinitely, because it would in the end redound to its benefit. It is but a present trifling inconvenience to it, while the strain upon some of its petty rivals is a telling one.

There is another incident in connection with the compulsion of the construction companies, not generally known, which will be of interest to the student of present-day occurrences, and help to throw some additional light on this particular corner of the field of capitalist concentration and the methods employed therein.

The name of the United States Realty and Construction Company has not previously been mentioned in this story for the reason that it and the Fuller Company are made up of the same interests. Note the names mentioned above and you will see among them such men as the Standard Oil magnate, James Stillman, of the City Bank; Henry Morgenthau, of the Central Realty and Trust Company, of which Stillman is a director, and others, connected with the biggest railroad, oil and other interests. It is but natural that such men would foster a scheme for the eventual building up of a Building Trust in conjunction with their steel, oil and railroad monopolies. So, when they saw the success of the Fuller Company they organized the U. S. Realty and Construction Company, with a backing of nearly \$100,000,000, thus making the Fuller and others that may be absorbed later, subsidiary with the U. S. as the central power. So far the Fuller company is practically the whole thing.

The incident referred to relates to the struggle with its greatest rival—the Thompson-Starratt Company. The Fuller company, through the Stillman end, has an agreement with the Steel Trust by which it is said to have a big advantage over all competitors in the matter of getting its steel and iron, but in New York has no grip on the local lumber trade. On the other hand, Thompson, who is alleged to be largely interested in lumber concerns shipping to the local market, while at a disadvantage on steel, was appointed by Mayor Low through political influence to succeed Perez M. Stewart, as Superintendent of Buildings. This gave him and his assistants the drop on the Fullers and others in the matter of passing on lumber coming from outside interests, if they chose to so use their positions. Before long, however, a protest, said to have been worked up by the Fuller people, was made to Comptrol-

ler Grout on the ground that the appointment was illegal because the appointee lacked the qualifications called for by the city charter, namely, that the incumbent must have been an architect of ten years' standing preceding his appointment, which it is alleged was not the case with Thompson. So Grout has been prevailed upon to hold up the salary and render Thompson non est as a city official, leaving the Fuller company again on top.

These facts are recited to enable the reader to see the trend of events as observed by the writer, who doesn't hesitate to predict that in the course of time the U. S. Realty and Construction Co. will have eradicated its smaller rivals and absorbed the larger ones, after the manner of its big brothers and near relatives, the trusts of the steel, oil and railroad industries.

The Fuller company has now made an arbitration agreement of its own with the unions and its "friends" in the re-United Board of Building Trades are intensifying the fight with its rivals by defiance of the ultimatum of the Employers' Association.

The much-talked of prosecution of walking delegates and John Doe proceeded against construction companies will not be likely to amount to much, as the District Attorney, who is credited with aspiring to a Tammany Mayoralty nomination, is not foolish enough to spoil his chances by going out of his way to push the matter.

That there is corruption was plainly shown in the statements and affidavits made in connection with the arrest of Sam Parks, of the Housesmiths and Bridgemen's and Richard Carvel, of the Derriekens, Riggers and Pointers' and the recent published statement that a number of others are under charges.

The charges against Parks are made by the Hecla Iron Works, of Brooklyn, the president of which, Nels Poulsen, alleged Parks was paid \$2,000 to call off a strike; by Louis Brandt, a builder, who says he paid \$300 to Parks; by Herman Lobel, president of the Lobel-Andrews Company, who swore he also was forced to settle through the walking delegate for \$500, and Josephus Plenty of Jersey City, a builder of skylights, who said he gave \$200 to Parks to end a strike.

The \$2,000 check given by Poulsen to Parks bore the signature of E. Remington, of the Fuller Construction Co. The latter having cashed the check for Parks. On the morning of June 9, General Manager Francis Jackson of the Hecla Iron Works made the following remark to a newspaper man:

"If Mr. Jerome would summon the superintendents of some of the large building construction companies to the John Doe proceedings, he might get to the bottom of this trouble. The payrolls might show that some of the walking delegates were on the lists. It would probably throw some light on how the walking delegates exist and where they receive their money."

Joseph Fyfe, of the Amalgamated Association of Carpenters and Joiners, speaking of the Parks case, said:

"There are not only delegates of unions, but also employers, who are corrupt. We know of cases where employers wanted to break their contracts, and in order to do this offered money to delegates to help them out. Other employers were doing their work in a crooked way and bribed delegates to keep quiet."

"There are a few of our delegates who will accept these bribes, but most of them are loyal to their unions. This court of investigation probably will show up just as many crooked employers as it does union men."

This interview was shown to King, of the press committee of the Builders' Association, who said it was correct, and that there were undoubtedly crooked builders. The association, he said, hoped that the investigation would bring out all the facts.

The charges against Carvel were made by Thomas Hopper, Vice-President of Isaac A. Hopper & Son.

In his affidavit Hopper says that in November, 1902, his company was constructing the Lutheran Evangelical Church, at the northwest corner of Sixty-fifth street and Central Park West. A strike had been called on the work, owing to a disagreement with one of the sub-contractors on the work. He says he then received a visit from Carvel at his office, who intimated that the strike might be settled for three or four hundred dollars.

Hopper refused to pay the money and took the matter before the United Board of Building Trades. He says he stated the case, but did not tell that Carvel wanted money for himself. On February 12, he alleges, he met Carvel, who demanded \$900, saying that as Hopper had taken the matter before the Board there were more men to "fix." On the 13th of February, Hopper says, he went to the saloon at Fifty-fourth street and Third avenue and met Carvel. He had with him nine \$100 bills which he tendered to the business agent. He says that Carvel would not take the money, but told him to give it to the bartender.

"When I told him I did not think it

was safe," says the deponent, "Carvel said: 'Oh, that's all right, thousands of dollars have been received by the bartender in the same way.' Hopper says that Carvel then went to the telephone and gave orders that settled the strike, and the men were all back at work in a few days.

District Attorney Jerome was at that time hearing some remarkable stories of "grafting" by walking delegates of unions to call strikes on or off. One of the most barefaced of these transactions is that in connection with a strike on the Union Club building, in which the "graft" amounted to some \$17,000. This story, as told by Jerome, is as follows:

"In the fall of 1902 the Amalgamated Painters and Decorators' Union, which was represented in the Board of Building Trades, made a demand for increased wages and shorter hours for the men employed by the contractors doing work on the Union Club building. The employers refused the demands and a strike followed.

"The employers, most of them, cabinet-makers and decorators, then got together and tried to devise some way by which the work could be finished. They finally decided that the best way would be to build up the Brotherhood of Painters and Decorators, which is a national association. They knew a struggle would follow any work, because it was not represented in the Board of Building Trades. A general strike on their other work would follow any such attempt.

"They decided that it was absolutely necessary to get the Brotherhood represented in the Board of Building Trades. The president of the Brotherhood, J. C. Bahlhorn, of Lafayette, Ind., came on here to talk the matter over with the employers and agreed, on behalf of the Brotherhood, to subscribe \$2,500 to a fund to be used to pay the proper people to get the Brotherhood represented in the Board. After this offer had been made, an officer of the employers' association, one of the leading cabinet makers in this town, took each one of the seventeen employers interested and got each one to agree to pay \$250 toward this fund, which was to be used to get the Brotherhood on the board. I should say that fifteen of the seventeen employers agreed to do this. The other two positively refused.

"At this time the Union Club itself contributed a sum, which I shall not name, to this same fund. The entire money was handled by one of the head cabinet makers and by a construction company in this city. Most of the money was paid to these handlers in checks.

"About this time the officers of the Brotherhood notified the employers that they would have to withdraw their offer to pay \$2,500 toward the fund, because the reason for the expenditure would have to be entered on their books, and as a Brotherhood election was approaching the fact that they had spent money in this way might be used against the officers, all of whom were candidates for re-election. This made it necessary to raise the money in some other way; so each of the fifteen employers consented to give up \$200 more, making \$450 from each man.

"This \$6,750, besides the amount subscribed by the Union Club (believed to have been a total of \$17,000) was turned over to five walking delegates, all voting members of the Board of Building Trades. The result was the admission of the Brotherhood to the Board and, of course, the ruining of the Amalgamated Union. This was a deliberate selling out of a labor union by walking delegates. The Amalgamated strike came to an end at once, and a complete victory was won by the employers.

"The names of the five walking delegates I will not give out at this time. The names of the firms which gave up \$450 each are as follows:

"William Baumgarten, No. 323 Fifth avenue; D. S. Hess & Co., No. 421 Fifth avenue; Potter & Styms, No. 375 Lexington avenue; Herts Bros., No. 507 Fifth avenue; Kimball & Sons, No. 437 Fifth avenue; Allard & Sons, 8437 Fifth avenue; T. D. Waddleton, No. 109 Fifth avenue; Lowenstein & Sons, No. 383 Fifth avenue; Newman & Co., No. 375 Fifth avenue; Horler & Co., No. 382 Fifth avenue; W. & J. Sloane, No. 848 Broadway; the Tiffany Studio, No. 333 Fourth avenue; Peter Tanchard, No. 173 Clinton street, Brooklyn.

"If it can be shown that this money was paid to the walking delegate as initiation fee and was turned in to the board, why there is nothing criminal about it. But if this money went into the hands of the walking delegates, and stayed there, it is a larceny."

Of such are the conditions prevailing in the building world and such are the antics of the labor fakirs which have been "dignified" by the Kangaroo Social Democratic party of many names, with the title of "noble waging of the class struggle." Out upon such rottenness and the cowards who cringe to the rotten element! Build up the S. L. P. and the S. T. & L. A. that the eyes of the workers may be opened and their fighting spirit trained in the right direction.

AKRON, O.—W. Garritz, 194 Upson street.
ALBANY, N. Y.—Clinton H. Pierce, 11 S. Swan street.
BALTIMORE, MD.—R. W. Stevens, 632 Columbia ave.
BELLEVILLE, ILL.—Walter Gosh, 701 Division street.
BOSTON, MASS.—Frank Bohmback, 87 Lamartine street, Jamaica Plain.
BRIDGEPORT, CONN.—J. C. Custer, 819 Broad street.
BUTTE, MONT.—P. J. Dwyer, 432 E. Broadway.
BUFFALO, N. Y.—B. Reinsman, 521 Broadway.
CANTON, O.—John H. G. Juergens, 1104 High street.
CHICAGO, ILL.—Frank Hruby, 2639 Monticello avenue.
CINCINNATI, O.—Frank F. Young, 34 East Thirtieth street.
CLAYPOOL, IND.—Oliver P. Stoner, 404 N. Main street.
COLUMBUS, OHIO—Otto Steinhoff, 493 So. Third street; Oscar Freer, 222 N. 3rd street.
CLEVELAND, O.—P. C. Christiansen, 78 Fairfield street. Fred Brown, 225 Isabella street.
CLINTON, IOWA.—E. C. Matson, 102 Hooper street.
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.—L. Gunther, 3 South El Paso st.
COLUMBUS, OHIO—Otto Steinhoff, 493 So. Third street. Oscar Freer, 222 N. 3rd street.
DENVER, COLO.—Charles J. Michael, 406 Club building.
DETROIT, MICH.—P. Friema, Jr., 334 Arndt street.
DUBLIN, IRELAND.—J. W. O'Brien, 43 Belvidere place.
DULUTH, MINN.—Ed. Kriz, 614 Garfield avenue.
E. ST. LOUIS, ILL.—G. A. Jennings, 1523 Broadway.
ELIZABETH, N. J.—G. T. Petersen, 218 1/2 Adams street.
ERIE, PA.—Fred Uhlman, 650 W. 19th street.
EVANSVILLE, IND.—C. Schaad, 17 W. Pennsylvania street.
EVERETT, MASS.—Chas. H. Chabot, 181 Broadway.
FALL RIVER, MASS.—Robert Bateson, 371 Crescent street.
GARDNER, MASS.—Thos. Smith, 13 Greenwood street.
GLOVESVILLE, N. Y.—M. E. Wilcox, 47 E. Main street.
GRAND JUNCTION, COLO.—J. F. Sloan, Hamilton, Ohio—Ben Hilbert, Jr., 831 Central avenue.
HAMILTON, ONT., CANADA.—Isaac Shapiro, 64 Ferguson avenue south.
HOBOKEN, N. J.—Julius Eck, 310 Garden street.
HOUSATON, MASS.—M. Rafter, 17 Glen street.
HOMESTEAD, PA.—James Lawry, 701 A. Street.
HOUSTON, TEX.—John J. Loverde, Socialist Labor Hall, 707 Preston avenue.
INDIANAPOLIS, IND.—J. Burkhardt, 294 E. Adams street.
JACKSONVILLE, ILL.—J. De Castro, 714 W. Railroad street.
KANSAS CITY, KAN.—Jos. Trautwein, 1121 N. 10th street.
KALAMAZOO, MICH.—Charles Peterson.
KANSAS CITY, MO.—O. M. Howard, 1215 Independence avenue.
KEOKU, IOWA.—C. D. Lavin.
LAWRENCE, MASS.—Gilbert S. Smith, 125 Garden street.
LINCOLN, NEB.—Dr. H. S. Aley, P. O. Box 1015.
LONDON, ONT., CANADA—George L. Bryce, 327 Grey street.
LOS ANGELES, CAL.—Louis C. Haller, 205 1/2 So. Main street.
LOUISVILLE, KY.—Thos. Sweney, 1408 High street.
LOWELL, MASS.—John Farrell, 24 Wilder street.
LYNN, MASS.—Jacob Overs, Highland House.
MALDEN, MASS.—Henry Lyndell, 27 Stanton street.
MARIBORO, MASS.—Henry Tebeau.
MEDWAY, MASS.—John Cunningham, Village street.
MELODOR, MASS.—George Anderson, 18 Almond street.
MILFORD, CONN.—Gust. Langer, P. O. 774.
MILWAUKEE, WIS.—John Vierthaler, 349 5th street.
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—Chas. A. Johnson, Labor Lyceum, 30 Washington avenue S.
MONTREAL, CAN.—J. M. Couture, 753 Mount Royal avenue.
NEWARK, N. J.—A. P. Witel, 78 Springfield avenue.
NEW BEDFORD, MASS.—Dennis McGoff, 100 State street.
NEW BRITAIN, CONN.—Roger W. Egan, 209 E. Main street.
NEW HAVEN, CT.—Christian Schmidt, 205 E. Main street.
NEW ORLEANS, LA.—Leon Leconte, 2402 Iberville street.
NO. ABINGTON, MASS.—Jer. Devine.
NOVEMBER, MO.—D. A. Reed.
Box 127.
PATRICKSON, N. J.—John C. Butterworth, 110 Abington avenue.
PAWTUCKET, R. I.—Charles H. Dana, 109 Dexter street.
PEKESKILL, N. Y.—Charles Zolot, 1,511 1/2 Main street.
PEORIA, ILL.—Fred Lichtsinn, 303 Argo street.
PHILADELPHIA, PA.—Edmond Seidel, 2125 Ridge street.
PUEBLO, COL.—L. A. Knight, 170 W. 17th street.
RICHMOND, VA.—J. E. Madison, cor. Lewis and Hollings street.
ROANOKE, ILL.—Frank McFay.
ROCHESTER, N. Y.—Chas. H. Raby, 861 Clinton avenue, South.
ROCKVILLE, CONN.—Fred Suesman, 13 River street.
SAN ANTONIO, TEX.—Frank Lettner, 207 Main street.
ST. CHARLES, MO.—E. W. Carpenter, 51 Third street; J. A. Roultan, 305 Larkin street.
SAN PEDRO, CAL.—Alexander Muhlberg.
SAN JOSE, CAL.—Fred Hamann, 42 Highland street.
ST. LOUIS, MO.—J. P. Strupel, 1332 Franklin avenue; John Neumann, 227 Arnold street; Charles E. Hager, 1813 Franklin avenue.
ST. PAUL, MINN.—Samuel Johnson, 504 Jackson street.
SALEM, MASS.—John White, 1 Barton square.
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH—P. C. Nelson, 148 Major avenue.
ST. CHARLES, MO.—R. H. McHugh.
SAGINAW, W. MICH.—Henry Ubricht, 1015 Macklawn street.
SCHENECTADY, N. Y.—J. S. Walberger, Box 557.
SEATTLE, WASH.—William H. Weinber, 903 Post street.
SHEBOYGAN, WIS.—F. H. Buer, 620 Pennsylvania avenue.
SOMEVILLE, MASS.—A. Quarnstrom, 20 Waver street.
SOUTHAMPTON, ENGLAND.—Alfred Harbut, care L. Warden, Green Grocer and Florist, London Road.
waid, General Delivery.
SPRINGFIELD, MASS.—F. A. Nagler, 141 E. Main street.
SYRACUSE, N. Y.—J. Trainor, Room 14, Myers Block.

WOMAN UNDER SOCIALISM

By AUGUST BEBEL

Translated from the Original German of the Thirty
Third Edition

By DANIEL DE LEON

Copyright, 1903, by the NEW YORK LABOR NEWS COMPANY.

PART II.

WOMAN IN THE PRESENT—Continued.

As to the effect that marriage and celibacy exercise upon the mind, the following figures furnish testimony. In 1882, there were in Prussia, per 10,000 inhabitants of the same conjugal status, 33.2 unmarried male and 29.3 female lunatics, while the percentage of the married ones was 9.5 for men, and 9.5 for females, and of the widowed, 32.1 males, and 25.6 females. Social conditions can not be considered healthy, that hinder a normal satisfaction of the natural instincts, and lead to evils like those just mentioned.

The question then rises: Has modern society met the demands for a natural life, especially as concerns the female sex? If the question is answered in the negative, this other rises: Can modern society meet the demands? If both questions must be answered in the negative, then this third arises: How can these demands be met?

"Marriage and the family are the foundation of the State; consequently, he who attacks marriage and the family attacks society and the State, and undermines both"—thus cry the defenders of the present order. Unquestionably, monogamous marriage, which flows from the bourgeois system of production and property, is one of the most important cornerstones of bourgeois or capitalist society; whether, however, such marriage is in accord with natural wants and with a healthy development of human society, is another question. We shall prove that the marriage, founded upon bourgeois property relations, is more or less a marriage by compulsion, which leads numerous ills in its train, and which fails in its purpose quite extensively, if not altogether. We shall show, furthermore, that it is a social institution, beyond the reach of millions, and is by no means that marriage based upon love, which alone corresponds with the natural purpose, as its praise-singers maintain.

With regard to modern marriage, John Stuart Mill exclaims: "Marriage is the only form of slavery that the law recognizes." In the opinion of Kant, man and woman constitute only jointly the full being. Upon the normal union of the sexes rests the healthy development of the human race. The natural gratification of the sexual instinct is a necessity for the thorough physical and mental development of both man and woman. But man is no animal. Mere physical satisfaction does not suffice for the full gratification of his energetic and vehement instinct. He requires also spiritual affinity and oneness with the being that he couples with. Is that not the case, then the blending of the sexes is a purely mechanical act: such a marriage is immoral. It does not answer the higher human demands. Only in the mutual attachment of two beings of opposite sexes can be conceived the spiritual ennobling of relations that rest upon purely physical laws. Civilized man demands that the mutual attraction continue beyond the accomplishment of the sexual act, and that it prolong its purifying influence upon the home that flows from the mutual union. The fact that these demands can not be made upon numberless marriages in modern society is what led Barnhagen von Ense to say: "That which we saw with our own eyes, both with regard to contracted marriages and marriages yet to be contracted, was not calculated to give us a good opinion of such unions. On the contrary, the whole institution, which was to have only love and respect for its foundation, and which in all these instances (in Berlin) we saw founded on everything but that, seemed to us mean and contemptible, and we loudly joined in the saying of Frederick Schlegel which we read in the fragments of the 'Athenaeum': Almost all marriages are concubines, left-handed unions, or rather provisional attempts and distant resemblances at and of a true marriage, whose real feature consists, according to all spiritual and temporal laws, in that two persons become one." Which is completely in the sense of Kant.

The duty towards and pleasure in posterity make permanent the love relations of two persons, when such really exists. A couple that wishes to enter into matrimonial relations must, therefore, be first clear whether the physical and moral qualities of the two are fit for such a union. The answer should be arrived at uninfluenced; and that can happen only, first, by keeping away all other interests, that have nothing to do with the real object of the union,—the gratification of the natural instinct, and the transmission of one's being in the propagation of the race; secondly, by a certain degree of insight that curbs blind passion. Seeing, however, as we shall show, that both conditions are, in innumerable cases, absent in modern society, it follows that modern marriage is frequently far from fulfilling its true purpose; hence that it is not just to represent it, as is done, in the light of an ideal institution.

How large the number is of the marriages, contracted with views wholly different from these, can, naturally, not be statistically given. The parties concerned are interested in having their marriage appear to the world different from what it is in fact. There is on this field a state of hypocrisy peculiar to no earlier social period. And the State, the political representative of this society, has no interest, for the sake of curiosity, in initiating inquiries, the result of which would be to place in dubious light the social system that is its very foundation. The maxima, which the State observes with respect to the marrying of large divisions of its own officials and servants, do not suffer the principle to be applied that, ostensibly, is the basis of marriage.

Marriage—and herewith the bourgeois idealists also agree—should be a union that two persons enter into only out of mutual love, in order to accomplish their natural mission. This motive is, however, only rarely present in all its purity. With the large majority of women, matrimony is looked upon as a species of institution for support, which they must enter into at any price. Conversely, a large portion of the men look upon marriage from a purely business standpoint, and from material viewpoints all the advantages and disadvantages are accurately calculated. Even with those marriages, in which low egotistical motives did not turn the scales, raw reality brings along so much that disturbs and dissolves, that only in rare instances are the expectations verified which, in their youthful enthusiasm and ardor, the couple had looked forward to.

And quite naturally. If wedlock is to offer the spouses a contented conjugal life, it demands, together with mutual love and respect, the assurance of material existence, the supply of that measure of the necessities of life and comfort which the two consider requisite for themselves and their children. The weight of cares, the hard struggle for existence—these are the first nails in the coffin of conjugal content and happiness. The cares become heavier the more fruitful the marriage proves itself, i. e., in the measure in which the marriage fulfills its purpose. The peasant, for instance, is pleased at every call that his cow brings him; he counts with delight the number of young that his sow litters; and he communicates the event with pleasure to his neighbors. But the same peasant looks gloomy when his wife presents him with an increase to his own brood—and large this may never be—which he be-

lieves to be able to bring up without too much worry. His gloom is all the thicker if the new-born child is a girl.

We shall now show how, everywhere, marriages and births are completely controlled by the economic conditions. This is most classically exemplified in France. There, the allotment system prevails generally in the country districts. Land, broken up beyond a certain limit, ceases to nourish a family. The unlimited division of land, legally permissible, the French peasant counteracts by his rarely giving life to more than two children,—hence the celebrated and notorious "two child system," that has grown into a social institution in France, and that, to the alarm of her statesmen, keeps the population stationary, in some provinces even registering considerable retrogression. The number of births is steadily on the decline in France; but not in France only, also in most of the civilized lands. Therein is found expressed a development in our social conditions, that should give the ruling classes cause to ponder. In 1881 there were 937,057 children born in France; in 1890, however, only 838,059; accordingly, the births in 1890 fell 98,998 behind the year 1881. Characteristic, however, is the circumstance that the number of illegitimate births in France was 70,079 for the year 1881; that, during the period between 1881 and 1890, the number reached high-water mark in 1884, with 75,754; and that the number was still 71,086 strong in 1890. Accordingly, the whole of the decline of births fell exclusively upon the legitimate births. This decline in births, and, we may add, in marriages also, is, as will be shown, a characteristic feature, noticeable throughout the century. To every 10,000 French population, there were births in the years:

1801.....333	1841.....282	1888.....269
1821.....307	1851.....270	1886.....230
1831.....303	1856.....261	1890.....210

This amounts to a decline of births in 1890, as against 1801, of 114 to every 10,000 inhabitants. It is imaginable that such figures cause serious headaches to the French statesmen and politicians. But France does not stand alone in this. For a long time Germany has been presenting a similar phenomenon. In Germany, to every 10,000 population there were births in the years:

1880.....406	1883.....358
1875.....403	1887.....369.4
1880.....390	1890.....357.6

Accordingly, Germany too reveals, in the space of only 21 years, a decline of 40 births to every 10,000 inhabitants. Similarly with the other States of Europe. To every 10,000 population there were live births:

States.	From 1863-1867.	From 1886-1888.	Decrease.	Increase.
Ireland.....	262	231	31	..
Scotland.....	353	313	40	..
England and Wales.....	353	314	39	..
Holland.....	388	344	44	..
Belgium.....	320	293	27	..
Switzerland.....	320	278	42	..
Austria.....	374	380	..	6
Hungary.....	309	445	..	46
Italy.....	378	371	7	..
Sweden.....	320	297	23	..
Norway.....	344	308	36	..

The decline in births is, accordingly, pretty general, only that, of all European States, it is strongest in France. Between 1886 and 1888, France had, to every 1,000 inhabitants, an average of 23.0 births, England 22.0, Prussia 41.27, and Russia 48.8.

These facts show that the birth of a human being, the "image of God," as religious people express it, ranks generally much cheaper than new-born domestic animals. What this fact does reveal is the unworthy condition that we find ourselves in,—and it is mainly the female sex which suffers thereunder. In many respects, modern views distinguish themselves but little from those of barbarous nations. Among the latter, new-born babes were frequently killed, and such a fate fell to the lot of girls mainly; many a half-wild race does so to this day. We no longer kill the girls; we are too civilized for that; but they are only too often treated like pariahs by society and the family. The stronger man crowds them everywhere back in the struggle for existence; and if, driven by the love for life, they still take up the battle, they are visited with hatred by the stronger sex, as unwelcome competitors. It is especially the men in the higher ranks of society who are bitterest against female competition, and oppose it most fiercely. That working-men demand the exclusion of female labor on principle happens but rarely. A motion to that effect being made in 1877, at a French Labor Convention, the large majority declared against it. Since then, it is just with the class-conscious workmen of all countries, that the principle, that working-women are beings with equal rights as themselves, makes immense progress. This was shown especially by the resolutions of the International Labor Congress of Paris in 1889. The class-conscious workman knows that the modern economic development forces woman to set herself up as a competitor with man; but he also knows that, to prohibit female labor, would be as senseless an act as the prohibition of the use of machinery. Hence he strives to enlighten woman on her position in society, and to educate her into a fellow combatant in the struggle for the emancipation of the proletariat from capitalism. True enough,—due to the ever more widespread employment of female labor in agriculture, industry, commerce and the trades—the family life of the workman is destroyed, and the degenerating effects of the double yoke of work for a living, and of household duties, makes rapid progress in the female sex. Hence the endeavor to keep women by legislative enactments, from occupations that are especially injurious to the female organism, and by means of protective laws to safeguard her as a mother and rearer of children. On the other hand, the struggle for existence forces women to turn in ever larger numbers to industrial occupations. It is married women, more particularly, who are called upon to increase the meager earnings of her husband with her work,—and she is particularly welcome to the employer.

Modern society is without doubt more cultured than any previous one, and woman stands correspondingly higher. Nevertheless, the views concerning the relations of the two sexes have remained at bottom the same. Professor L. von Stein published a book,—a work, he it said in passing, that corresponds ill with its title—in which he gives a poetically colored picture of modern marriage, as it supposedly is. Even in this picture the subaltern position of woman towards the "lion" man is made manifest. Stein says among other things: "Man deserves a being that not only loves, but also understands him. He deserves a person with whom not only the heart beats for him, but whose hand may also smooth his forehead, and whose presence radiates peace, rest, order, a quiet command over herself and the thousand and one things upon which he daily reverts: he wants someone who spreads over all these things that indescribable aroma of womanhood, one who is the life-giving warmth to the life of the house."

In this song of praise of woman lies concealed her own degradation, and along therewith, the low egotism of man. The professor depicts woman as a vaporous being, that, nevertheless, shall be equipped with the necessary knowledge of practical arithmetic; know how to keep the balance between "must" and "can" in the household; and, for the rest, float zephyr-fashion, like sweet spring-tide, about the master of the house, the sovereign lion, in order to say every wish from his eyes, and with her little soft hand unwrinkle the forehead, that he, "the master of the house," perchance himself crumpled, while brooding over his own stupidity. In short, the professor pictures a woman and a marriage such as, out of a hundred, hardly one is to be found, or, for that matter, can exist. Of the many thousand unhappy marriages; of the large number of women who never get so far as to wed; and also of the millions, who like beasts of burden beside their husbands, have to drudge and wear themselves out from early morn till late to earn a bit of bread for the current day,—of all of these the learned gentleman knows nothing. With all these wretched beings, hard, raw reality wipes off the poetic coloring more easily than does the hand the colored dust of the wings of a butterfly. One look, cast by the professor at those unnumbered female sufferers, would have seriously disturbed his poetically colored picture, and spoiled his concept. The women, whom he sees, make up but a trifling minority, and that these stand upon the plane of our times is to be doubted.

"Mr. E., a manufacturer, informed me that he employed females exclusively, at his power-loom. He gives a decided preference to married females, especially those who have families at home dependent on them for support; they are attentive, docile, more so than unmarried females, and are compelled to use their utmost exertions to procure the necessities of life. Thus, the virtues of the peculiar women of the female character to be perverted to her injury—thus all that is most dignified and tender in her nature is made a means of her bondage and suffering. Speech of Lord Ashley, March 15, 1854, on the Ten Hour Factory Bill. Marx's 'Capital.'"
"Die Frau auf dem Gebiete der Nationalökonomie."

An oft-quoted sentence runs: "The best gauge of the culture of a people is the position which woman occupies." We grant that; but it will be shown that our so much vaunted culture has little to brag about. In his work, "The Subjection of Woman,"—the title is typical of the opinion that the author holds regarding the modern position of woman—John Stuart Mill says: "The lives of men have become more domestic, growing civilization lays them under more obligations towards women." This is only partly true. In so far as honorable conjugal relations may exist between husband and wife, Mill's statement is true; but it is doubtful whether the statement applies to even a strong minority. Every sensible man will consider it an advantage to himself if woman step forward into life out of the narrow circle of domestic activities, and become familiar with the currents of the times. The "chains" he thereby lays upon himself do not press him. On the other hand, the question arises whether modern life does not introduce into married life factors, that, to a higher degree than formerly, act destructively upon marriage.

Monogamous marriage became, from the start, an object of material speculation. The man who marries endeavors to wed properly, along with a wife, and this was one of the principal reasons why daughters, after being at first excluded from the right to inherit, when descent in the male line prevailed, soon again reacquired the right. But never in earlier days was marriage so cynically, in open market, so to speak, an object of speculation; a money transaction, as it is to-day. To-day trading in marriage is frequently conducted among the property classes—among the propertyless the practice has no sense—with such shamelessness, that the oft-repeated phrase concerning the "sanctity" of marriage is the merest mockery. This phenomenon, as everything else, has its ample foundation. At no previous period was it, as it is to-day, hard for the large majority of people to raise themselves into a condition of well-being, corresponding to the then general conceptions; nor was at any time the justified striving for an existence worthy of human beings so general as it is to-day. He who does not reach the goal, feels his failure all the more keenly, just because all believe to have an equal right to enjoyment. Formerly, there are no rank or class distinctions. Each wishes to obtain that which, according to his station, he considers a goal worth striving for, in order to come at fruition. But many are called and few are chosen. In order that one may live comfortably in capitalist society, twenty others must pine; and in order that one may wallow in all manner of enjoyment, hundreds, if not thousands, of others must renounce the happiness of life. But each wishes to be of that minority of favored ones, and seizes every means, that promise to take him to the desired goal, provided he does not compromise himself too deeply. One of the most convenient means, and, withal, nearest at hand, to reach the privileged social station, is the money-marriage. The desire, on the one hand, to obtain as much money as possible, and, on the other, the aspiration after rank, titles and honor thus find their mutual satisfaction in the so-called upper classes of society. There, marriage is generally considered a business transaction; it is a purely conventional bond, which both parties respect externally, while, for the rest, each often acts according to his or her own inclination. Marriage for political reasons, practiced in the higher classes, need here to be mentioned only for the sake of completeness. With these marriages also, as a rule, the privilege has tacitly existed—of course, again, for the husband to a much higher degree than for the wife—that the parties keep themselves scathless, outside of the bonds of wedlock, according as their whims may point, or their needs dictate. There have been periods in history when it was part of the *bon ton* with a Prince to keep mistresses; it was one of the princely attributes. Thus, according to Scherr, did Frederick William I. of Prussia (1713-1740), otherwise with a reputation for steadiness, keep up, at least for the sake of appearances, relations with a General's wife. On the other hand, it is a matter of public notoriety that, for instance, August the Strong, King of Poland and Saxony, gave life to 300 illegitimate children; and Victor Emanuel of Italy, the *re galantuomo*, left behind 32 illegitimate children. There is still extant a romantically located little German residence city, in which are at least a dozen charming villas, that the corresponding "father of his country" had built as places of recreation for his resigned mistresses. On this head thick books could be written: as is well known, there is an extensive library on these piquant matters.

The inside history of most of the German princely courts and noble families is to the informed an almost uninterrupted *chronique scandaleuse*, and not infrequently has been stained with crimes of blackest dye. In sight of these facts, it certainly is imperative upon the sycophantic painters of history, not only to leave untouched the question of the "legitimacy" of the several successive "fathers and mothers of their country," but also to take pains to represent them as patterns of all virtues, as faithful husbands and good mothers. Not yet has the breed of the augurs died out; they still live, as did their Roman prototypes, on the ignorance of the masses.

In every large town, there are certain places and days when the higher classes meet, mainly for the purpose of match-making. These gatherings are, accordingly, quite fitly termed "marriage exchanges." Just as on the exchanges, speculation and chaffer play here the leading role, nor are deception and swindle left out. Officers, loaded with debts, but who can hold out an old title of nobility; *roues*, broken down with debauchery, who seek to restore their ruined health in the haven of wedlock, and need a nurse; manufacturers, merchants, bankers, who face bankruptcy, not infrequently the penitentiary also, and wish to be saved; finally, all those who are after money and wealth, or a larger quantity thereof, government office-holders among them, with prospects of promotion, but meanwhile in financial straits—all turn up as customers at these exchanges, and ply the matrimonial trade. Quite often, at such transactions, it is all one whether the prospective wife be young or old, handsome or ugly, straight or bent, educated or ignorant, religious or frivolous, Christian or Jew. Was it not a saying of a celebrated statesman: "The marriage of a Christian stallion with a Jewish mare is to be highly recommended?" The figure, characteristically borrowed from the horse-fair, meets, as experience teaches, with loud applause from the higher circles of our society. Money makes up for all defects, and outweighs all vices. The German penal code punishes the couple with long terms of imprisonment; when, however, parents, guardians and relatives couple their children, wards or kin to a hated man or woman only for the sake of money, of profit, of rank, in short, for the sake of external benefits, there is no District Attorney ready to take charge, and yet a crime has been committed. There are numerous well organized matrimonial bureaus, with male and female panders of all degrees, out for prey, in search of the male and female candidates for the "holy bonds of matrimony." Such business is especially profitable when the "work" is done for the members of the upper classes. In 1878 there was a criminal trial in Vienna of a female pander on the charge of poisoning, and ended with her being sentenced to fifteen years in the penitentiary. At the trial it was established that the French Ambassador in Vienna, Count Bonnevillie, had paid the pander 12,000 florins for procuring his own wife. Other members of the high aristocracy were likewise highly compromised through the trial. Evidently, certain Government officials had left the woman to pursue her dark and criminal practices for many years. The "why" thereof is surely no secret. Similar stories are told from the capital of the German Empire. During recent years, it is the daughters and heirs of the rich American capitalist class, who, on their side, aspire after rank and honors, not to be had in their own American home, that have become a special subject of matrimonial trading for the needy noblemen of Europe. Upon these particular practices characteristic light is thrown by a series of articles that appeared in the fall of 1889 in a portion of the German press. According thereto, a *chevalier d'industrie* nobleman, domiciled in California, had recommended himself as a matrimonial agent in German and Austrian papers. The offers that he received amply betray the conception concerning the sanctity of marriage and its "ethical" side prevalent in the corresponding circles. Two Prussian officers of the Guards, both, as they say themselves, belonging to the oldest nobility of Prussia, declared that they were ready to enter into negotiations for marriage because, as they frankly confessed, they owed together 60,000 marks. In their letter to the pander they say literally: "It is understood that we shall pay no money in advance. You will receive your remuneration after the wedding trip. Recommend us only to ladies against whose families no objections can be raised. It is also very desirable to be introduced to ladies of attractive appearance. If demanded, we shall furnish, for discreet use, our own pictures to your agent, after he shall have given us the details, and shown us the pictures, etc. We consider the whole affair strictly confidential and as a matter of honor (?), and, of course, demand the same from you. We expect a speedy answer through your agent in this place, if you have one. Berlin, Friedrichstrasse 107, December 15, 1889. Baron v. M., Arthur v. W."

An Austrian nobleman also, Karl Freiherr v. M.—of Goeding in

"See 'Fürst Bismarck und seine Leute,' Von Busch."
"Sections 180 and 181."

Moravia, seized the opportunity to angle for a rich American bride, and to this end sent to the swindle-bureau the following letter:

"According to a notice in the papers of this place, you are acquainted with American ladies who wish to marry. In this connection I place myself at your service, but must inform you that I have no fortune whatever. I am of very old noble stock (Baron), 34 years old, single, was a cavalry officer and am at present engaged in building railroads. I should be pleased to inspect one or more pictures, which, upon my word of honor, I shall return. Should you require my picture, I shall forward same to you. I also request you to give me fuller information. Expecting a speedy answer in this matter, I remain, very respectfully, your Karl Freiherr v. M., Goeding, Moravia, Austria, November 29, 1889."

A young German nobleman, Hans v. H., wrote from London that he was 5 feet 10 tall, of an old noble family, and employed in the diplomatic service. He made the confession that his fortune had been greatly reduced through unsuccessful betting at the horse races, and hence found himself obliged to be on the lookout for a rich bride, so as to be able to cover his deficit. He was, furthermore, ready to undertake a trip to the United States forthwith.

The *chevalier d'industrie* in question claimed that, besides several counts, barons, etc., three Princes and sixteen dukes had reported to him as candidates for marriage. But not noblemen only, bourgeois also longed for rich American women. An architect, Max W.—of Leipzig, demanded a bride who should possess not only money, but beauty and culture also. From Kehl on the Rhine, a young mill-owner, Robert D., wrote that he would be satisfied with a bride who had but 100,000 marks, and he promised in advance to make her happy.

But why look so far, when at hand the quarry is rich! A very patriotic-conservative Leipzig paper, which plumes itself very particularly upon its Christianity, contained in the spring of 1894 an advertisement, that ran thus: "A cavalry officer of the Guards, of large, handsome build, noble, 27 years of age, desires a financial marriage. Please address, Count v. W., Post Office General Delivery, Dresden." In comparison with the fellow who makes so cynical an offer, the street-walker, who, out of bitter necessity, plies her trade, is a paragon of decency and virtue. Similar advertisements are found almost every day in the papers of all political parties—except the *Social Democratic*. A Social Democratic editor or manager, who would accept such or similar advertisements for his paper, would be expelled from his party as dishonorable. The capitalist press is not troubled at such advertisements; they bring in money; and it is of the mind of the Emperor Vespasian, *non olet*, it does not smell. Yet all that does not hinder that same press from going rabid mad at "the marriage-undermining tendencies of Socialism." Never yet was there an age more hypocritical than the one we are living in. With the view to demonstrate the fact once more, the above instances were cited.

Bureaus of information for marriage,—that's what the advertisement pages of most of the newspapers of our day are. Whosoever, be it male or female, finds near at hand nothing desirable, entrusts his or her heart's wants to the pious-conservative or moral-liberal press, that, in consideration of cash and without coaxing, sees to it that the kindred souls meet. With illustrations, taken on any one day from a number of large newspapers, whole pages could be filled. Off and on the interesting fact also crops out that even clergymen are sought for husbands, and, *vice versa*, clergymen angle for wives, with the aid of advertisements. Occasionally, the suitors also offer to overlook a *slip*, provided the looked-for woman be rich. In short, the moral turpitude of certain social circles of our society can be pilloried no better than by this sort of courtship.

State and Church play in such "holy matrimony" a by no means handsome role. Whether the civil magistrate or clergyman, on whom may devolve the duty to celebrate the marriage, be convinced that the bridal couple before him has been brought together by the vilest of practices; whether it be manifest that, neither in point of age nor that of bodily or mental qualities, the two are compatible with each other; whether, for instance, the bride be twenty and the bridegroom seventy years old, or the reverse; whether the bride be young, handsome and joyful, and the bridegroom old, ridden with disease and crabbed;—whatever the case, it concerns not the representative of the State or the Church; it is not for them to look into that. The marriage bond is "blessed,"—as a rule, blessed with all the greater solemnity in proportion to the size of the fee for the "holy office."

When, later, such a marriage proves a most unfortunate one—as foreseen by everybody, by the ill-starred victim, in most instances the woman, herself,—and either party decides to separate, then, State and Church,—who never first inquire whether real love and natural, moral impulses, or only naked, obscene egotism tie the knot—now raise the greatest difficulties. At present, moral repulsion is but rarely recognized a sufficient ground for separation; at present, only palpable proofs, proofs that always dishonor or lower one of the parties in public esteem, are, as a rule, demanded; separation is not otherwise granted. That the Roman Catholic Church does not allow divorces,—except by special dispensation of the Pope, which is hard to obtain, and, at best, only from board and bed—only renders all the worse the conditions, under which all Catholic countries are suffering. Germany has the prospect of receiving, in the not too far distant future, a civil code that shall embrace the whole Empire. It is, therefore, a side-light upon our times that, although even the superficial observer must reach the conclusion that at no previous period have unhappy marriages been so numerous as now—a natural consequence of our whole social development—the new draft for a civil code still renders divorce materially difficult. It is but a fresh instance of the old experience,—a social system, in the throes of dissolution, seeks to keep itself up by artificial means and compulsion, and to deceive itself upon its actual state. In declining Rome, marriage and births were sought to be promoted by premiums: in the German Empire, whose social order stands under a constellation similar with that of the decaying Empire of the Caesars, it is now sought to prevent the ever more frequent desire for the dissolution of marriage by means of forcible constraints.

Thus people remain against their will chained to each other through life. One party becomes the slave of the other, compelled to submit out of "conjugal duty" to that other's most intimate embraces, which, perhaps, it abhors more than insult or ill-treatment. Fully justified is Montegazza's dictum: "There is probably no worse torture than that which compels a human being to put up with the caresses of a person it does not love."

We ask, Is such a marriage—and their number is infinite—not worse than prostitution? The prostitute has, to a certain degree, the freedom to withdraw from her disgraceful pursuit; moreover, she enjoys the privilege, if she does not live in a public house, to reject the purchase of the embraces of him who, for whatever reason, may be distasteful to her. But a sold married woman must submit to the embraces of her husband, even though she have a hundred reasons to hate and despise him.

When in advance, and with the knowledge of both parties, marriage is contracted as a marriage for money or rank, then, as a rule, matters lie more favorably. The two accommodate themselves mutually, and a *modus vivendi* is established. They want no scandal, and regard for their children compels them to avoid any, although it is the children who suffer most under a cold, loveless life on the part of their parents, even if such a life does not develop into enmity, quarrel and dissension. Often accommodation is reached in order to avoid material loss. As a rule it is the husband, whose conduct is the rock against which marriage is dashed. This appears from the actions for divorce. In virtue of his dominant position, he can indemnify himself elsewhere when the marriage is not pleasing to him, and he can not find satisfaction in it. The wife is not so free to step on side-roads, partly because, as the receiving sex, such action is, for physiologic reasons, a much more risky one on her part; then, also, because every infraction of conjugal fidelity is imputed a crime to her, which neither the husband nor society pardons. Woman alone makes a "slip"—be she wife, widow or maid; man, at worst, has acted "incorrectly." One and the same act is judged by society with wholly different standards, according as it be committed by a man or a woman. And, as a rule, women themselves judge a "fallen" sister most severely and pitilessly."

"The Physiology of Love."

(To be continued.)

The publication of "Woman Under Socialism" began on Sunday, May 24, in The Sunday People, and in The Weekly People of May 30. It will appear in serial form in The Sunday and Weekly until completed, when it will be published in book form.

WEEKLY PEOPLE

5, 4 and 6 New Beads St., New York.
P. O. Box 1576. Tel. 129 Franklin.

Published every Saturday by the
Socialist Labor Party.

Bundle rates: Less than 100 copies, 1 cent a copy; 100 to 500 copies, 1/2 cent a copy; 500 or more, 1/4 cent a copy.

Entered as second-class matter at the New York postoffice, July 13, 1900.

As far as possible, rejected communications will be returned, if so desired, and stamps are enclosed.

SOCIALIST VOTE IN THE UNITED STATES.

In 1880.....	2,060
In 1892.....	21,157
In 1896.....	36,564
In 1900.....	34,191
IN 1902.....	53,617

FREE SPEECH.

Elsewhere in this issue will be found the announcement of the decision of the Appellate Division of the Court of Appeals of this State confirming the decision of the Amsterdam, N. Y., court that sentenced three members of the Socialist Labor Party for speaking in the open air.

It was in the days when the saffron colored press and pulpit was inciting the populace to riot. McKinley had been assassinated. That was the opportunity of every interest in the land that lived on the sweat of Labor's brow to blacken Socialism in the public esteem. Of course, the onslaught was directed against the Socialist Labor Party. Its speakers were hounded. That none was lynched was a miracle. As an official declaration of war ever unchains the social beasts that had been forced to lie low, and gives them "carte blanche" to commit murder, the assassination of McKinley was utilized by the Beast of Capitalism as a pretext to drop the mask of humanity and to step out in its true colors. Of course such conduct utterly failed to intimidate the S. L. P. men. All others who had been claiming to be Socialists of various degrees of "butts" crept into holes, and waited for the storm to blow over. The S. L. P., however, being no "fair weather craft," breasted the storm alone. If, indeed, terrorism can silence the speech of Movement; if indeed, the terrorizers find their game succeeds—then terrorism feels encouraged, and will not let up. The S. L. P. bearded the beast.

The trial of the three S. L. P. men, whom the popinjay of the Social Democratic party of this State claimed as its members from the safe hole into which it had crept, was a result of the terrorism that capitalist interests had set on foot. The trial, of course, went against them; and now, dodging the issue, the Appellate Division confirms the fines.

For all that, the S. L. P. won out. No blow struck for Right, no stand taken for Freedom ever is lost. In these instances the organized capitalist brigandage that rules the country failed absolutely—its judgments of conviction notwithstanding. The S. L. P.'s position, valiantly maintained by its members, and brilliantly expressed in the briefs of Party's Counsellor, Benjamin Patterson, and published elsewhere in this issue, are of the nature that resists rebuffs, and will ever be reasserted.

THE POOR MANUFACTURER!

Mr. Milton P. Higgins, president of the Norton Emery Wheel Company, of Worcester, Mass., wept several tears before the Training Department of the National Educational Association of Boston on the 9th inst. The tears were dropped in the course of an address delivered by him on "Education for the Trades." To sum up the allegations of fact and the conclusions of Mr. Higgins on the sorrows and troubles that beset the manufacturers, himself among the lot no doubt, this is the state of things:

Skilful workmen are rare; they are so rare that the manufacturer often has to give good pay to "an untidy, coarse, ignorant, profane and drunken" fellow if he is a skilful man. The reason of it is that education is faulty. Manual training in the schools has brought no help. It only lays "a broad foundation for a better manhood," but what the manufacturer stands in need of is not "broad foundations," "better manhood" and all that sort of thing, but skilled workmen, men who have received a proper education for the trades. Schools for technical training have proved failures, what they turn out is not available. No better are engineering colleges. A manufacturer, "after he

has filled with entire satisfaction all the important engineering positions in the factory with efficient technical engineering graduates, still finds his unmet need for skilled workmen as great as ever."—Due to such distressing conditions, Mr. Higgins weeps for the manufacturers, the sorely tried darlings.

It is obvious that what really troubles Mr. Higgins is to find good men cheap. That's the sum and substance of his jeremiad. The graduates of the technical and engineering schools, of whom there are more than jobs for, would make good skilled workmen, but they want higher pay than the skilled workmen that Mr. Higgins is after. This being the real fact, sympathy with Mr. Higgins and his fellow manufacturers is out of place. They are themselves to blame. Had they been less vociferous in floating the lie "plenty of room above," these graduates would not have gone as numerous into the technical and engineering schools; less training would have been given, and they could now be overstocking the "skilled workmen" market to Mr. Higgins' heart's content. Their present absence from that market, wider knowledge, and greater pretensions are all due to the Higginses.

But these gentlemen need not fret. For a while things will be hard for them. But not long. Soon the market will be overstocked with these graduates. When that day comes their "pretensions" will have come down, and then Mr. Higgins and his brother manufacturers, reversing the experience of the Pharaohs, will have a fat season after the lean. After having been compelled "to give good pay" to "untidy, coarse, ignorant, profane and drunken" fellows because they were skilled workmen and there were not enough of them, they will then be in condition to give what pay they may please to the tidiest, gentlest, most trained, Sunday-schoolish and total abstainers of graduates: they will find all they want of these goods: they will be able to take their pick and will then make up for the present "hard time" they are having.

In the meantime, of course, poor manufacturers!

THE CASE OF CONGRESSMAN LITTAUER.

Due to a great measure to the circumstance that Congressman Littauer and President Roosevelt are chums, the Littauer case is making a sensation. It is fortunate that it does. It helps emphasize one of the many absurdities of capitalist society.

Mr. Littauer is a glove manufacturer, and he is a Congressman; furthermore the army and navy need gloves. Where outside of Paradise or the Elysian fields, is it imaginable that a man so situated will not seek to secure the Government as a customer?

Why does Mr. Littauer make gloves? For his health? Surely not. Is it that he has an artist's eye and love for the beauty of the human hand? Certainly not. He took to gloves as readily as he would have taken to shoe laces, or rails, or eggs, had the circumstances that surround him, at the time he "chose" his occupation, promised larger returns from shoe laces, rails, or eggs. In other words, Mr. Littauer lives in a social system whose practical morality is "do others or you will be done." It alters nothing in the case that Mr. Littauer approves of and upholds such a social system as the only one that combines the ideal with the practical on earth. The fact is that such is the social system, and furthermore that the very Government that now decides to "probe" his case, and to punish him if, despite the law, he, a Congressman, did business with the Government, upholds such a system.

What is the difference between a Littauer "dividing profit over the figure 1.55" with the Government, or a Congressman, interested in leather for manufacture, seeking to use the Government to lower the tariff; or another Congressman, who raises leather as a new product, seeking to use the Government to raise the tariff on leather? Casuists may find a difference. There is none in morals. It is an absurdity to build a government on the principle of placing wolves in charge of sheep. Such is capitalist government. Individual ownership of the means of production sets man against man. The government, born of such a state of things, cannot exercise morality. Morality in its mouth can only be hypocrisy.

Mr. Littauer did not go to Congress for the fun of it. Not one in a hundred Congressman does. There is nothing to probe in Littauer that is not to probe in ninety-nine out of every hundred officials. They are capitalists; it is their government; they use it—which of them does not?

Of course, this is a crying wrong. Of course it is against the theory that the Government is of, for and by the people. True. The theory is correct. But the facts of the capitalist system do not tally with the theory. No "probing" steads in such cases; the only thing that steads is a revolution that will bring the social facts up to the height of the theory, and make it practical.

Not "probing," but Socialism!

THAT "SOCIALISTIC" POSTOFFICE.

Of course there is not going to be any investigation of the Postoffice scandals worth the name. Nor is any necessary. The "Socialistic" feature of the institution transpires quite clearly from what is known now. Further, fuller and more frightful details could only be of cumulative value.

What is a Socialist institution? It is a concern that owes its existence to the breath of the abolition of the wages system of slavery. As a result of this a Socialist institution is run for the benefit of the community. Seeing moreover that no terrestrial institution can be run by any other than human agencies, it follows that those who are directly active in operating a concern are themselves members of the community, and consequently must share in the benefit of the Socialist institution the same as all others. There is one more essential feature to a Socialist institution: it is a feature that may be said to sum up all the others: from top to bottom there is democratic equality, despite order; from top to bottom, and radiating in all directions, there is mutual support. How do the facts stand in the Postoffice, as revealed by the present scandals, and as simultaneously revealed among the letter-carriers?

The scandals throw light above. High officials have been found peculating; others have been found stealing; others are using the institution as a clearing house to pay their political debts; and yet others have sunk still deeper, they are paying for their illicit amours with jobs to their paramours' brothers, parents and EVEN HUSBAND.

While this is going on "upstairs," what is seen "downstairs"? The letter-carriers are ranked under two categories: the first class receive \$1000, the second receive \$850 as the highest possible. Even the wages of the first class are inhumanly low. The employees in such an institution are exploited. Both classes have been trying to get a raise—the first, to \$1200; the second, to \$1000. In the course of their efforts, the first class has discovered that its chances would be endangered if the second class succeeds; and vice versa the second class: The P. O., being animated by the breath of capitalism, seeks to leave the large profits for the railroad companies and the large salaries for the upper officers: a rise in the wages of the letter-carriers would reduce the revenues of railroads and upper officers: consequently there is little or no inclination to help the letter-carriers: finally, breathing in this spirit, the letter-carriers divide—each of the two classes pulling for itself, and seeking to keep back the other, as the surest means of increasing its own chance!

That is the spectacle that the P. O. is now presenting: a spectacle to be abhorred;—a spectacle that cannot cease until capitalism ceases.

The ground-work of a Socialist institution is the absence of economic classes. Whatever institution is reared on economic classes, whatever its external form may be—as far as Socialism is concerned—is no better than a whitened sepulchre.

THREE GREENES AND NONE GREEN.

Gen. Greene is a Police Commissioner in this city. But that does not yet tell the whole tale. A Police Commissioner is theoretically in sample of civic virtue. He is to enforce law and morality, so he must be, or is supposed to be, a paragon. Again, when in such a paragon the title of "General" is found combined with that of Police Commissioner, the paragonship increases greatly—theoretically. Nor yet is this all. General Greene is not merely Police Commissioner; he is that as the appointee of a fusion or "Good Government" administration. Accordingly, he is, as it were, the sublimation of purity—theoretically. Yes, theoretically.

And now comes Receiver Tatnall, acting upon an order of Judge Kirkpatrick, and brings out a series of facts, connected with the Asphalt Trust, from which it appears that one Greene sold imaginary stock at a fabulous price to one Greene, and that this stock was turned in to one Greene, "insider" in

the bogus Trust, and that these three Greenes, a veritable Trinity, were—who? Just one person, to wit, General Police Commissioner Greene. Thus there were three Greenes, with nothing green about them but the name.

People who are merely theoreticians in Socialism will be amazed at such a spectacle. Not that the turpitude of the triple Greene and yet non-green transaction would astonish them. Not that. They are sound on the understanding of capitalist "morality." What will amaze is that a reputed capitalist and rich man should be driven to such shifts. There is nothing amazing about it.

Few if any capitalists stand upon firm ground. They all stand on banana peels; the only thing that stands unchanged is the capitalist class. Among themselves, the members of that class wage such a murderous competitive battle that most of them—considering their needs, so as to keep up appearances and their "credit"—may be truly said to live from hand to mouth;—net results Asphalt Trusts, etc., etc.

Who would bestow his energies to keep a social system that begets such ulcers above, and the want and privation below, that are the share of the masses?

Who would spend his forces to beat down an Ice Trust Tammany with an Asphalt Trust "Good Government"?

Not a day passes but the capitalist system, together with its political agencies, roar out to the working class and to all decent citizens:

"Down with capitalism and its political parties! Up with Socialism!"

NONSENSE ON THE LABOR QUESTION.

There is a book being circulated that is so full of bad logic, contradictions, half-truths and whole lies, as to earn for it the title, "Nonsense on the Labor Question." For instance, Politicians are denounced as frauds who make promises so that no sensible man will trust them. They are purchaseable and corrupt. Then it is shown that, with regard to the trust magnates, or "monopolists" that "Courts, Legislatures and Congresses are afraid of them."

Now, one who is not a crook himself, would conclude that since politicians are untrustworthy and corrupt, and courts, legislatures and congresses are dominated by trust magnates that the working class cannot obtain any legislative or other aid to advance its interests from those same politicians, courts, legislatures and congresses. Does the author of "Nonsense on the Labor Question" so conclude, and so concluding, does he advise the working class to form a political party of its own, and elect honest men to office, in order that it may dominate those courts, legislatures and congresses in the interest of the working class? "Not on your life!"—to borrow an inelegant but expressive phrase from the slang of the day. On the contrary, the hypocritical author of "Nonsense on the Labor Question," true to his clerical antecedents, with eyes filled with crocodile tears for the sufferings of the working class, advises its members to entrust their interests to those very politicians, courts, legislatures and congresses!

All that labor has to do is not to act directly and openly, but indirectly and secretly. All that labor has to do is to influence these politicians—the men who make promises that no sensible man will trust, and are bought by the corporations—with their votes, and, presto! all the bounties of the political paradise belong to it! All that labor has to do is to elect "legislative" and other committees, made up of these politicians and their cronies, station them at Washington and other places to lobby and to dicker, i. e., intensify political corruption, and capitalist domination, and, quicker than you can say "Jack Rabbit!" the courts, legislatures and congresses will cease to be dominated by the trust magnates, and the triumph of labor will be secured! In fewer words, the way to do a thing is to promote those things that will prevent you from doing it, i. e., if labor wishes to succeed politically all it has to do is to promote the very means by which it is defeated!

Who says "Nonsense on the Labor Question" isn't well named? Out on such nonsense! Oppose to it the teachings of the class-conscious press and literature of the Socialist Labor Party—teachings which point out that the working class must emancipate itself and that in order to do so it must organize to capture the powers of state and utilize them in overthrowing capitalism and instituting Socialism.

THE FISH IS LANDED.

For some time the Populist Lincoln, Neb., "Independent" has been "taking falls" out of the attitude of Socialism on money. Its conduct in the matter very much resembled that of a veteran fish that would not take hold too hard of the alluring bait, knowing that there was a hook inside. It nibbled and pulled away. Finally, however, it bit, and bit well, with the result that we now have the fish landed.

In its issue of last June 25, and under the head "Independent School of Political Economy," the paper publishes over the signature of Charles Q. de France what purports to be an answer and refutation of the Socialist Labor Party pamphlet "Money." We may leave Mr. Q. de France aside, and deal with Mr. Independent of Nebraska, seeing that the latter makes the answer its own.

First, considerable space is spent in the article with tiresome iterations of the statement that "legal tender" has "nothing whatever to do with exchange." Seeing that the said pamphlet "Money" spends considerable space, not in STATING but in PROVING that very thing—that the "legal tender" feature of money is one thing, its "medium of exchange" another—all these statements are superfluous.—The landed fish that flops landward and not waterward but utterly wastes its energies: the further it goes in that direction the worse for it.

Second, another chunk of space is taken up with the assertion that "the power of the 'tender' exists nowhere in the United States outside of the public offices and the courts," and with supplemental assertions that "it [legal tender] has to do with paying taxes and cancelling judgments rendered in the courts." Proof is hereby furnished of a fact, which to mention even in terms the most courteous one can think of sounds offensive, but which nevertheless must be mentioned. That fact is that the "free coinage" is ignorant of facts, and, consequently, can not choose but fall into error. When a tenant, a mortgagee, a drawer of a note that becomes due, a purchaser on credit—in short, any one who assumes a money obligation that matures at a future date—lays down before, tenders to his creditor the amount due, the creditor is bound to accept the payment in cancellation of the debt. IF THE MONEY TENDERED IS PRONOUNCED "LEGAL TENDER" by the Government. If, in such a case, the creditor, for whatever reason, refuses to accept, suspects the money, or what not, HE CANNOT SUE, AND IF HE DOES HE LOSES AND HAS TO PAY THE COSTS. The reason is that tender, legal tender, was made to him. All these transactions happen out of court, they do not concern "public offices," they have nothing to do with "taxes," there is no "cancelling of judgments" about them. Of course, "legal tender" figures in these latter and governmental transactions also, but for every once that it figures there, it figures fully a hundred times in those others mentioned above, where the transaction is purely private,—and there is no "voluntary adaptation" about it.

Third, but even in these respects, obvious as they are, the complete landing of the fish is not as palpable as in those passages where it is "denied in toto" that labor is the sole producer of wealth. It is in this that the fish is landed. We are not told who it is that produces wealth. Even the landed fish knows enough to be silent on that. It would not do to say that the silver mine barons, who live on the sweat of the brow of their miners, and then have them shot down, either produce or help to produce wealth: it would not do to say that the small farmer, who engages farm-hands and not infrequently does not pay them at all, and who pays them so trifling a wage for so short a season that they become tramps the moment they are discharged and then are chased away with dogs, is the producer of wealth; it will not do to say that the several American duchesses abroad, whose silver mine inheritance the Populist Newlands superintends, are the producers of wealth. No! But murder will out. And it is out. All this talk about "legal tender," "medium of exchange," "Government fiat," etc., etc., on the part of a Populist leader is but so much dust raised to give an appearance of science and of opposing existing conditions to nothing but bourgeois "reform." Free coinage takes its place, together with the "gold bug," the "octopus," etc., on that side of the line that believes in and proposes to continue the system of fleecing the working class—the sole producer of all wealth.

If the free-coinageists and all other "reform" fishes in the capitalist pool would but start their arguments with the denial that labor produces all wealth, they would be understood so much more easily. But, of course, they don't like to be understood.

The capitalist newspapers that are publishing advice on how to overcome the heat, print nothing about abolishing the capitalist system of exploitation, which compels millions to swelter in stifling tenements, while enabling a few to enjoy the cool comforts of a houseboat on some beautiful inland stream, or the refreshing delights of some mountain wood and waterfall. Such advice would be incompatible with the Christian Science idea of diminishing the effects of the heat by not talking about them—that is, by making the overcoming of heat a matter of the mind and not a matter of economics.

Shame on the Volkszeitung for a thankless, soulless corporation! Just think of it, this is the way in which it disposes of one of its paladins in the 1899 taxation discussion, the paladin whose letter, pronouncing the Volkszeitung "brilliant and convincing," was at the time given a leading space—leading enough almost to eclipse Statistician Jonas, with his "\$300 taxes a year paid by the workman's family"—this is the way:

"DETECTIVES AFTER GROSSMAN."

"Chicago, July 6.—Detectives of the three largest insurance companies in the country are hunting here for Rudolph Grossman, who, in order to escape a five-year sentence in the penitentiary of New Jersey, skipped from the East. It is stated that Grossman was insured in the New York Life, Mutual Life and Equitable Life Insurance Company, for \$10,000 each. It is alleged that a short time ago his relatives, claiming he had committed suicide, demanded the insurance. They could not furnish satisfactory proof of his death, and the matter was put in the hands of detectives."

It is said that republics are thankless. This may or may not be so, but one thing is pat—that the Volkszeitung corporation is a thankless dog. That is not the way to treat a voucher of one's "brilliance" and "convincing" powers. Shame!

Can it be that Grossman is trying to get his per capita of those \$300 taxes?

Educational circles pretend to be very much exercised over the change of policy in the Stanford University, attending the election of Mrs. Stanford to the presidency of the board of trustees. Hereafter the power to choose and discharge professors will be taken from President Jordan and given into the hands of the trustees, i. e., Mrs. Stanford. Just why this change should evoke any comment is not clear, as this wealthy woman has all along regulated the choice and discharge of professors according to her class interests, since the death of her husband, Leland Stanford, who founded the university with her. In connection with the other capitalist "benefactors" of American educational institutions, Mrs. Stanford has made the teaching of ideas favorable to the perpetuation of the robber methods by which her vast wealth was acquired, the sole criterion by which to gauge the ability or inability of the professors who are invited to join, or are compelled to leave, the Stanford faculty. The system of production and distribution today is capitalistic. All the institutions of modern times are but reflexes of this condition. It would be surprising then, if the Stanford University were an exception to the rule.

The negro problem, so-called, which is just now agitating the country with renewed violence, appears, from recent discussions, to be more of an economic than a racial problem. A successful and prominent manufacturer of the South, Ashley Horne of Clayton, North Carolina, speaking of big cotton crops in the South, declares the time for them "is at an end." And then he proceeds to explain that "it will be a rare thing if the South ever produces more than an 11,000,000-bale crop. Scarcity of labor is responsible for this condition, which is more emphasized this year than ever before." A well-known commercial newspaper, discussing this statement, points out that "For many generations back the negroes have 'worked' the Southern plantations to the absolute exclusion of almost every other sort of labor. They are the best laborers that the world affords, not only for planting and cultivating the crop, but also for picking it and handling it at almost every stage of its movement up to the factory door—sometimes inside of that too. In fact, the negroes furnish the great bulk of unskilled labor of every sort in the cotton growing States." Then follows some figures on negro population, after which comes this statement: "They (the negroes) are, of course, leaving the plantations steadily, attracted by the advantages of town and city life; and every year at the picking season the complaint is heard of the scarcity of plantation hands. The rising generation of blacks are being educated industrially as well as in the liberal art. . . ." Then this newspaper echoes the assertion that "the more negroes the whites educate and 'elevate' the worst off the South is industrially," and it cites the conclusion of the old-time Southerners "that negro education is bad for the South as long as the South's chief industry is cotton raising." Here is an explanation of the fierce renewal of "the race question." The South needs the negro and, consequently, it combats any philanthropic, educational, and political measure that renders him more dissatisfied, migratory and progressive. This explains the South's cry of "hands off" to "the meddlers of the North," and its brutal sneers at negro education, and the necessity for negro subjugation. On the other hand, the negro who leaves the South and comes North is brought into industrial competition with the labor of that section, which results in a resentment that fans the racial dislike into criminal animosity. And so the race problem grows because the economic problem does. Settle the latter and the former will subside until it ceases to be a menace to progress and civilization.

On the Pacific Coast the business men are said to be talking of the signs of good times there evident. In this age of reason along economic lines it is foolish to believe in signs.



UNCLE SAM AND BROTHER JONATHAN

BROTHER JONATHAN.—I'd like to know upon what principle Socialists claim that the working class should have all the wealth, and the capitalist class none.

UNCLE SAM.—Upon the very simple principle that the working class does all the work of production and the capitalist class does none.

P. J.—Go away!

U. S.—Whither?

B. J.—I don't care whither in particular. That's not so.

U. S.—What's not so?

B. J.—That the capitalists do no work.

U. S.—If you know of any who does let me know.

B. J.—Did you ever hear of Jay Gould?

U. S.—Yes.

B. J.—Did you ever read his biography?

U. S.—Several of them, and they prove my statement.

B. J.—You must have been asleep while reading them; or you must have read very imperfect ones.

U. S.—Neither.

B. J.—Why, I remember distinctly that it is recorded in the one I read that he used to work regularly 16 hours a day.

U. S.—(puts his hands to his hips and roars.)

B. J.—What are you roaring about?

U. S.—At your blunder. I now see the funny error that you have fallen into.

B. J.—What error?

U. S.—You are getting mixed upon the word "work." See here. Does a pick-pocket "work" or does he not?

B. J.—Guess he does.

U. S.—Does a forger "work," or does he not?

B. J.—I guess he, too, works.

U. S.—Now don't you see the difference between "work" and "work"?

B. J.—(puckers up his eyelids as if a flood of light is pouring into his eyes.)

U. S.—All extortion may be termed "work." But there are two sorts of extortions. One sort is productive of benefits to society; it either directly enriches its store of wealth, or of knowledge, or it does it indirectly. This sort of extortion is the work done by the working class. An other sort of extortion is productive of nothing, at least of nothing that is good, and may be productive of much that is bad. Not an additional blade of grass, or an additional shoe string, nor one particle of the material wealth needed by man is brought forth by the extortion of the pirate, the forger, the pickpocket or any other criminal, nor does their extortion bring forth one bit of useful knowledge. The extortion of all such people does only this: it transfers to their own pockets the wealth created by the productive work of others. This sort of extortion is the work of the capitalist class.

It. J.—Well, I must admit, that throws a new light upon the subject.

U. S.—The capitalist class does not do any useful work. It schemes, indulges in tricks by which it transfers from the hands of the working class the wealth that they produce, and its several members cudgel their brains and "work" 16 or more hours a day upon fraudulent devices to cheat one another. This sort of work, so far from being entitled to any reward, is entitled only to severe punishment. That's why we Socialists say that the capitalists are entitled to nothing except bolts and bars.

B. J.—If that's the only sort of work they do they surely deserve the prison.

U. S.—On the other hand, the intellectual and manual workers, the working class, exerts itself in the interests of life. Its mental and manual efforts do all the thinking, and produce all the material things that civilized man aspires to, and that life requires. That's why we Socialists say that all the wealth belongs to the working class.

B. J.—So say I now!

U. S.—Don't ever again allow yourself to be deceived by the words that capitalists and their hirelings fling about. WORK is noble. No capitalist works, except in the sense of the multi-millionaire father in the following story:

Multi-millionaire to applicant for his daughter's hand: "Do you work, sir?"

Applicant for the hand of multi-millionaire's daughter: "I do sir."

Multi-millionaire, to applicant for his daughter's hand: "Whom do you work?"

The Old Dominion Steamship Company is engaged in a strike of marine engineers at Norfolk, Va. It is evidently hard pressed, as it resorts to threats and declares that "several old employees of the company, who were soon to have been retired on pensions, permitted the strikers to get them out on the strike, and they will not be re-employed by the company." This threat cannot be without its good results to the working class in general, no matter what its effects may be on these old employees in particular, inasmuch as it exposes the true character of the pension. Many unsophisticated workmen regard the pension as a species of voluntary philanthropy, given by employers out of the goodness of their heart to employees who have no legal or moral claim for the same on the employer. He having made their wages, etc., etc. As seen above, the pension is nothing of the kind. It is a means of increasing the dependence of the employee upon the employer, makes him a more abject, servile and profitable creation. Instead of being a matter of voluntary philanthropy, pensions are a means of promoting profits.

CORRESPONDENCE.

(Correspondents who prefer to appear in print under an assumed name will attach such name to their communications, leaving their own signature and address. None other will be recognized.)

A Telegrapher's Fourth of July Declaration.

To The Daily and Weekly People.—I am a telegrapher of thirty-five years' work in a toll of hell, going ahead just as a crab crawls. At twenty years of age I got \$75 a month (1876), and now, at 47, with six of a family, I get but \$40, and my "prosperity" is not in my pay envelope, but in increased rent and cost of living, and the difference between real earnings and what should be my "share" is made up by my sons working and wife renting out rooms.

I reside in a city that has the reputation of being great, yet it has a city government absolutely purchased for cash last February—(see McClure's Magazine for May, "Pittsburg, a City Ashamed")—and for the past twenty-five years was in the clutches of a political "king," C. J. Magee (now dead), but "Long live the King"—Thomas S. Bigelow is his successor, yet Pittsburg is about as contented and corrupt as the City of Brotherly Love. (See July McClure's.) How long will the American people be mere sheep, jumping to the lead of Quay, Hanna, Platt, Addicks, Cleveland (the coming American "Diaz," a la Mexico)?

As an old telegrapher, I read The Weekly People of June 27 with great interest, as it's a true and real picture—too mild—but your fifteen-year telegrapher is not personally able to realize the misery of the thirty-five to fifty year veterans, who are compelled to pound typewriters all day on a constant strain, with a noise similar to that of a boiler-making shop; and, if a victim of the turn-out-to-the policy of the Western Union, is cut off from the new pension plan of the Postal, because he has worn out life in a rival's employ.

I am a member of an organization of old telegraphers: Old-Time Telegraphers' and Historical Association (1,000 members) of which Andrew Carnegie is a member, and John Brant, of Western Union, 195 Broadway, N. Y., is secretary, and was in employ of Andrew Carnegie's old firm for five years, and although while in Carnegie Steel Company's employ here as clerk contracted physical troubles since resulting in the awful disease of locomotor ataxia (spinal), both personally (to two appeals) and his friend Selwag has ignored my asking for help for medical treatment, so I am virtually sentenced to life of perpetual torture amid a world of church Christian and imitations of men.

It was McAdams' "Cry for Justice" that first turned my mind to Socialism, that had for twenty-five years been having great difficulty in choosing between two evils—the "fake" political parties: the "leader" party of Republicans and the Democratic party that is not democratic (all men on a common level).

I am a member of the Union of Telegraphers of which you refer to in "The Telegrapher" article, but I am simply for the same reason I belong to our local aid society (pay 30 cents month dues, dollar day if sick).

The Western Union had a "spy" in our union and it resulted in the discharge of twenty-five Western Union operators. The Postal took care of them. Almost all men and women in the Postal are victims of Western Union. All the "big" men of both telegraph companies are members of our brotherhood of old men, but that don't save us from discharge on the slightest pretext.

I, at forty-seven, have been a labor slave for thirty-five years. I was born May 9, 1836. I was the eldest of twelve—six boys, six girls. My ancestors were Irish, and all had big families.

I left public school at twelve to help my father in his drug store and telegraph office. Taught my brother (to strike out for myself) telegraphy and left home in 1873 and was manager of the Western Union Telegraph office at Foxburg, Clarion County, Pa. (oil regions), eighty-five miles up the Allegheny River from Pittsburg, Pa., during the campaign of the Hayes-Tilden election, just a boy of twenty, at a salary of \$75 a month, but taking no part in politics, for even at that early day I could not see any choice between the two evils—the party originally a Lincoln free men's organization, degenerated into a party of "leaders," with a following of "sheep," and the party that is not a pure democracy—all on a common level.

In my thirty-five years' industrial servitude to railroads, telegraph companies and Carnegie Steel Company (five years), I have had many hard and unjust "knocks" from official tyranny and from industrial slave drivers. Patrick R. Dillon, of Carnegie Steel Company, in 1893 told me (after cutting my pay from \$75 to \$40 a month, after five years' service) "that it did not make a damned bit of difference to me whether \$40 a month will keep your family of six or not," and, at this time, Andrew Carnegie was posing as a philanthropist, paying a quarter of a million dollars to victims of the then existing panic, he had about 5,000 men at work on the city parks at a dollar a day.

This event put me back to telegraphy with the Western Union till 1901, when another Irish brother (who classes the telegraphers in two divisions: those that get drunk on pay days and those having swollen heads—self-importance) "dred" me for going to the baths at Mount Clemens.

After walking the streets of this great city and my family only prevented

from starting by a brother Mason paying rent and living expenses, the Postal Telegraph management employed me at a pay rating reduction of \$20 a month, but by good work I have had a raise to \$80, with extra work of \$10 a month, but Sunday is my one day of heaven rest. Six days of work pounding typewriter with one finger of one hand (spinal trouble effect) is all the hell I desire in this life (and don't believe in any hell in any life to come—er death).

The Freedom that man has on this earth is much an imaginary article, and the Fourth of July celebration suggests, "What fools ye mortals be." The days of 76 were far different from 1903—76 Fighting Kings, 1903 "Hitting" with kings (Germany and England). If the common people do not soon own the earth there will be a universal revolution. The burden on our backs will become so heavy we can't stand it any longer, and the mule will kick off the load and be free—let us hope, forever; free in every way, no slavery or bondage, mentally or physically, men not monkeys.

Pittsburg, Pa., July 4.

Preaching the Only Gospel for Workingmen—The Gospel of Socialism.

To The Daily and Weekly People.—About three weeks ago, when subscribing for The Weekly People, I told Agent Paterson to notify you that I would not renew my subscription for the Daily for the coming year. The reason why I part with The Daily is because I think the Weekly is more beneficial to me in my present condition.

Close near the Swedish settlement in this city there is a wooded hill, where my countrymen (Swedes) go for an airing on Sundays. We take advantage of this to preach the only gospel for workingmen—the gospel of Socialism—and have thereby earned the enmity of all the good people in town, because we are running counter to different sky pilots, who want the field to themselves.

Now, to read and digest the Daily, and get my "sermon" ready, taxes my brain, which is pretty well used up by my master; more than I can afford. Hence I find the Weekly better for my purpose; hence also my decision to subscribe for it only.

This is a hard place to work; but just now the stalwarts are in high glee: there is a rift in the clouds. Arbaretan got 80 subscribers in the last four weeks from here; and next Sunday, the 12th inst., a Scandinavian S. L. P. will be formed with 25 members.

Yours on the firing line.

G. L.

Worcester, Mass., July 8.

To the Lowell Readers of The Daily, Weekly and Monthly People.

Fellow Workers: As you are aware, the S. L. P. of Massachusetts has elected Wm. H. Carroll, of Boston, for State Organizer, and have sent him out on a tour of the cities and towns of the State, speaking for the Socialist Labor Party and the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance. As the members of the S. L. P. are few and the expense to keep a State Organization permanently in the field will come near one hundred dollars a month, we, as voters and sympathizers, who read the party's papers and books, but are not members, should fall to and contribute funds to keep the Organizer working for our freedom, and to tell the wage workers what the S. L. P. and S. T. and L. A. will do for them.

Fellow workmen, at the last state election the city of Lowell cast over one hundred votes for the Socialist Labor Party, which showed that that number believed in what that party stands for; and, as the members are all workers, they don't receive one cent for keeping the party alive from any capitalist, labor fakir or political crook; every cent comes from the members who earn them by the sweat of their brow and hard toil in mill, shop, mine, etc.

Now, fellow workers, what I want to impress on you is this: Many of you in Lowell and other cities and towns in the state of Massachusetts are readers of The Daily, Weekly and Monthly People, but you never contribute one cent to help the party along. Most every readers could well afford, at least, ten cents a week, and I am sure, small as this amount is, it would pay all expenses of the State Organizer; so wake up, workmen of Lowell and other Massachusetts cities and towns. Send in your dimes and quarters to James Stevens, 17 Lynde street, Boston, Mass.

The readers of The People in Lowell, who don't want to take the trouble to send to the above address, should give all monies to that hard and faithful worker who, in the heat of Summer and the cold of Winter, can always be found pushing out Socialist Labor Party leaflets, Daily, Monthly and Weekly Peoples, after working hard all day. You will find him sometimes out as late as 11:30 p. m., doing party work. I refer to John Farrell, 24 Wilder street, Lowell.

Fellow workers, The Daily People is on file at the Lowell public reading room. The Monthly and Weekly readers should go there more and read it. The reading room is open from 9 a. m. to 9 p. m. daily, and on Sunday from 9 a. m. to 12 m., and from 6 p. m. to 9 p. m.

Fellow workers, readers and sympathizers of Lowell, the time is ripe to work for the Alliance, dear ripe; and, if the State Organizer can be supported, it would be a good plan to keep him in

Lowell for two or three weeks, going around mills and machine shops, where the wage slaves work 30 years and receive \$7.50 per week; or up at the bobbin shop, where big, strong men work for 70 cents per day.

Fellow workers, let's hear from you. I pledge myself for \$1.00 per month. Who will be the next to follow? Come, hustle all you readers and see if we can't raise enough to keep Carroll busy. Yours, for the better time,

John F. Kane.

Lowell, Mass., July 5.

LETTER-BOX

Off-Hand Answers to Correspondents.

A. C. NEW YORK.—The Single Tax does not make any distinction between agricultural and city land. It does not because it does not recognize fertility as an element. It considers locality only. A shop, for instance, located in a certain place where crowds pass, is on "better land" than an other. And so it is, and its rent will be accordingly. The same as to agricultural land. If this fact is closely looked at, this other fact will transpire: that the pivot on which the single tax revolves is not land, as usually supposed, but commerce. Remove commerce, that is, remove individual production and exchange, and the Single Tax theory of rent collapses.

J. A. W. PITTSBURG, PA.—The literature sent to you will have enlightened you by this time. That crowd that you went up the Monongahela River with, and which "did not favorably impress" you, is not in any way connected with the Socialist Labor Party. Having met them and sized them up it is not necessary to say any more about them.

S. J. ST. PAUL, MINN.—As to the book on "Anti-Semitism," you will see it has been reviewed. As to the other by Kautsky, it has not yet been read.

W. Y. H. CHICAGO, ILL.—The answering of a question may, at times, do the questioner more harm than good. It accustoms him to read slovenly, or not at all. This is an instance in point. That particular point happens to be covered in the "Woman Under Socialism" installment that appeared in the Weekly of last June 30, 2d col., 2d paragraph from the bottom. Get it; read it.

G. L. EL PASO, TEX.—Some, not many, but some of the so-called Socialist party agitators and writers will learn: they are reading The People now. As to the others, there is little hope for them. They imagine their recently breeched acquaintance with Socialism is full knowledge. Such will never improve.

D. F. BROOKLYN, N. Y.—It is a good test of a man's understanding of what the hour requires when he thoroughly appreciates, and thoroughly circulates the leaflet "The Difference." It won't do to allow freaks or crooks to reap where they sow. The S. L. P. has sowed. The masses must be enlightened on who the gentlemen of the Social Democratic party are. Enlighten them incessantly!

L. M. CINCINNATI, O.—It was on last 3d of July. The Social Democrats of this city called a mass meeting at Cooper Union for the superfluous purpose of announcing that their party is but an echo of the German Movement—consequently a ridiculous thing in this country, where capitalism has swept the path clean for Socialism.

P. M. B. BOSTON, MASS.—The broad-based ignorance of the capitalist journalists keeps them proof against any knowledge that may endanger their jobs. Policemen, sent to guard Socialist meetings, have been known to learn some thing; the capitalist press reporter never.

T. P. AKRON, O.—Yes; yes. They say all sorts of things about the S. L. P., and another set of all sorts of things against the S. L. P. man. But these gentlemen are exactly like those weaklings who go about harping on "life's dullness" and on "man's meanness," of whom it has been said that with them it is one of two things: either the cry of the blind eye, "I cannot see," or the complaint of the dumb tongue, "I cannot utter." Post yourself on the Socialist Movement.

G. S. NEW YORK.—The first answer given above answers your question on the Single Tax. If you have anything else in mind, come again.

A. B. H. ROCKLAND, ME.—The "Peonage Horrors" told about the South will have to be watched cautiously. They sound and look suspicious. They look and sound as if instigated by northern mill owners to deprive their Southern competitors of the cheap labor they now enjoy. The near future will tell. At any rate, the practice should be abolished, even tho' its abolition do no more good than the abolition of chattel slavery.

L. G. P. COLUMBUS, O.—By all means, read the Bible. Take the King James translation. You will learn good English. You will come across gems of thought and feeling. You will, especially if you simultaneously read some systematic treatise on ancient societies, find many interesting scraps of history. What is worthless in the book you can easily discard.

L. L. WESTERLY, R. I.—1. The Catholic Transcript forgets that Catholicism also is an ism. So it had better be careful how it denounces "isms." 2. The Catholic Transcript will have to refer its readers to the original of Vandervelde's speech, so that the intelligent ones may verify the Transcript's citations.

S. F. DAYTON, O.—Did that dog really bark? Why, we didn't know it. The boom of the S. L. P. guns drowns all such petty noises.

D. K. B. EVERETT, WASH.—Thomas A. Hickey was employed at this office as a reporter. He was discharged for incompetence, loafing and drunkenness. Shortly after that he was expelled from Section New York, Socialist Labor Party, for misappropriating party funds and for disorderly conduct toward the Section. Hickey and his colleagues, wherever they happened to have alighted, declared he would mop the earth with the Section and be speedily reinstated with flying colors. Thereupon the Section, before whom there was an application to reopen Hickey's case, took deliberate aim, and applying the toes of its square shoes to Hickey, gave the gentleman a kick with such precision and vigor that he went bumpity-bumping across the continent, and never stopped rolling until he landed in the arms of Dr. Titus of the "Seattle Socialist"—where he belongs.

S. PORTLAND, ORE.—You were answered long ago, and told we cared not to bother with your book.

G. W. J. OAKLAND, CAL.—When that day shall come, the working class will have better, nobler, more practical work on hand than to tell the roll of the wrongs it has suffered. Magnanimity is the attitude of the strong. The triumphant working class will be too strong for displays of weakness.

C. C. WATERTOWN, N. Y.—Take this fact: Many a union—we are compiling a list of them—demands large initiation fees for the express purpose of keeping out members. Are these men, so kept out, to lie down and die? Are they to render homage to such treatment by keeping out of work? What else is there for them to do but to "scab" it. Such men are not scabs.

2. Even such practices as "unionism" would not be blamable in and of themselves. They become blamable only when they are, not merely a part of, but THE Labor Movement, and the thing becomes execrable when people who call themselves Socialists shield such crimes with the shield of Socialism. Lay a body of men join to get jobs, keep up wages, etc., and build their organization for the purpose of securing such things to themselves. There is no more wrong in that than in so many people setting up a small shop. The idea is essentially "small bourgeois" and it would not be called names, "provided they claim not to be a 'Labor Organization' any more than any other shop. As it is, such 'Unions' sail union certain false pretences—just as Dewey and other capitalist large salaried officers sail under false pretences when they claim to be workmen, and their salaries wages. It is only the perpetrators of such deeds that the S. L. P. "calls names"—nor is any name too hard for them.

F. T. P. SAGINAW, MICH.—There is little, if any, danger that Austria or even Russia would come to the aid of the German Kaiser if his Empire were threatened from within. But the vote in Germany shows that the Empire is safe—for a while yet. It is, however, the fear that that "while" may come about sooner than comfortable; that causes the Imperial press to now hold the language they do. Before that they were correctly saying that the Social Democracy had been "remodeled," had "become practical," had "learned reason from Edward Bernstein," etc., etc. When they now yell against it as Socialists, they are simply trying to raise a bugaboo to frighten their neighbors. But that will not work. On the other hand, the feet of those are at the door who are about to bring about some interesting developments in Germany.

B. B. PHILADELPHIA, PA.—The tuning-fork by which to test the pitch of a Movement is the discipline a Movement imposes upon itself and enforces.

A. C. ST. LOUIS, MO.—The list omits one of the most important bits of work that the Socialist Labor Party is doing. The S. L. P. is not merely teaching Socialism; it is not merely teaching tactics; it is not merely "setting the example of the sturdiness that is needed"—the S. L. P. is doing something else besides: it is placing the Movement where it is becoming out of the power of any individual, or set of them to harm or derail it. This is essential. Some through vanity; others through malevolence, others in pursuit of petty pelf there ever will be who are attracted by a Revolutionary Movement. Their qualities render them dangerous. There is no such things as constitutional provisions against such anarchistic elements. Nothing will protect a Movement against such small souls but its own robustness. When such elements learn that it is useless to try their monkey shins with the Party, they will not attempt to, and they may then even develop into useful elements. The S. L. P. is doing that work to perfection.

V. F. K. HOLLAND, MICH.—Article on Woodworking Industry will be utilized. Send on basket-making article.

W. J. SPRINGFIELD, MASS.—Your matter having appeared in The People, it was not necessary to acknowledge receipts in these columns. Receipt is acknowledged only of matters receipt of which is not obvious.

F. T. PORTLAND, ORE.; D. W. D. OMAHA, NEB.; F. H. TRENTON, N. J.; S. R. T. PITTSBURG, PA.; J. J. SCRANTON, PA.; T. B. NEW YORK; H. H. F. HOBOKEN, N. J.—Matter received. Send on.

Trades unions become corrupt because they are impotent. Strike victories are woefully scarce, and when they do occur, the victorious (t) wage slave can well exclaim, as did Pyrrhus, "Another such victory, and I am undone." If the above were not facts, then the Socialist Labor Party would be useless.

As to the Proposed Amendment of Section Everett.

After having read the criticism of Comrade Karl Koechlin on Section Everett's proposition to amend the constitution, I consider it my duty to answer same, as a member of Section Everett at the time of its adoption by that Section.

Comrade Koechlin asks "Is it possible that clear-headed Socialists can ever think that the economic power wielded by the trades organizations is a naught to the Socialist propaganda," etc. I now ask the comrades "Is it possible for a clear-headed, etc. Socialist to think other than that they have proven themselves worse than a naught to the Socialist propaganda, in other words towards the Socialist overthrow—the Capitalist system?"

Trades unions become corrupt because they are impotent. Strike victories are woefully scarce, and when they do occur, the victorious (t) wage slave can well exclaim, as did Pyrrhus, "Another such victory, and I am undone." If the above were not facts, then the Socialist Labor Party would be useless.

As to the Proposed Amendment of Section Everett.

After having read the criticism of Comrade Karl Koechlin on Section Everett's proposition to amend the constitution, I consider it my duty to answer same, as a member of Section Everett at the time of its adoption by that Section.

Comrade Koechlin asks "Is it possible that clear-headed Socialists can ever think that the economic power wielded by the trades organizations is a naught to the Socialist propaganda," etc. I now ask the comrades "Is it possible for a clear-headed, etc. Socialist to think other than that they have proven themselves worse than a naught to the Socialist propaganda, in other words towards the Socialist overthrow—the Capitalist system?"

Trades unions become corrupt because they are impotent. Strike victories are woefully scarce, and when they do occur, the victorious (t) wage slave can well exclaim, as did Pyrrhus, "Another such victory, and I am undone." If the above were not facts, then the Socialist Labor Party would be useless.

GENERAL VOTE

On the Proposition of Section Everett, Mass., to Amend the Party Constitution.

New York, July 6, 1903.
To the Sections of the Socialist Labor Party.

Greeting:—The time set for amendments to the proposition of Section Everett, Mass., having expired, the said proposition is herewith submitted to a general vote and the Sections of the S. L. P. are called upon to have their members take such vote before September 12, 1903, on which date the reports must be in the hands of the undersigned.

No amendments have been sent in, hence the original proposition is the only thing to be voted on. For the reports of the vote, blanks will accompany this call containing the questions to be voted on.

Secretaries of State Committees will convey the call and the voting blanks to their respective Sections and members-at-large.

For the National Executive Committee, S. L. P.

HENRY KUHN,
National Secretary,
2-6 New Reade street,
New York City.

Preamble and Proposition of Section Everett, Mass., seconded by Sections Minneapolis, Minn.; Essex County, N. J.; Patton, Pa.; Somerville, Mass.; Albany County, N. Y., and Lincoln, Neb.

Realizing that, in order to bring about the emancipation of the wage-working class, the Socialist Labor Party must rest its principles and tactics on a scientific and unshakable foundation, and, having this point in view, Section Everett lays before you the following facts and asks you to give them your earnest consideration. The class-conscious members of the wage-working class have found by bitter experience, as well as observation, that, on the economic field, their chances against those of the capitalist class in the form of lockouts, strikes, boycotts and blacklisting are nil. We conclude from this, their weapons being useless, trade unions themselves are useless. Therefore, it is a waste of time to attempt to check the development of capitalism. The purpose of trade unions to stay capitalist development, places them in the same category with reform movements. Therefore, in order to bring this matter to a referendum vote of the party, in accordance with Art. V, Sec. 7, part b, of the National Constitution, we ask your indorsement of the following:

"Whereas, An alliance with a reform organization manifestly ignores the revolutionary principles of the Socialist Labor Party, resulting in a loss of prestige and inevitably leading to the downfall of the party; and,

"Whereas, Recent reports from this and other countries have shown the fallacy of alliances with trade unions;

"We therefore call upon you to indorse the following proposition to amend the constitution:

"That part K, of Sec. 7, Art. 5, and also Sec. 6, of Art. 7, be stricken out and the following section be inserted under article 2:

"There shall be no alliance between the Socialist Labor Party and the S. T. & L. A., or any other economic organization."

"Section Everett, S. L. P.,
"Louis H. Englehardt, Organizer, 141 Broadway, Everett, Mass."

QUESTIONS.

1. Shall Article 5, Section 7, part k, be stricken out?

(The said part k orders the N. E. C. to call for nominations for delegates to represent the S. L. P. at the National Conventions of the S. T. & L. A.)

2. Shall Article 7, Section 6, be stricken out?

(Said Article 7, Section 6, provides that the National organization of the S. T. & L. A. may be represented in the National Convention of the S. L. P. by three fraternal delegates having the qualifications of regular Party delegates.)

3. Shall there be added to Article 2 a Section (Section 21) to read: "There shall be no alliance between the Socialist Labor Party and the S. T. & L. A., or any other economic organization?"

As to the Proposed Amendment of Section Everett.

After having read the criticism of Comrade Karl Koechlin on Section Everett's proposition to amend the constitution, I consider it my duty to answer same, as a member of Section Everett at the time of its adoption by that Section.

Comrade Koechlin asks "Is it possible that clear-headed Socialists can ever think that the economic power wielded by the trades organizations is a naught to the Socialist propaganda," etc. I now ask the comrades "Is it possible for a clear-headed, etc. Socialist to think other than that they have proven themselves worse than a naught to the Socialist propaganda, in other words towards the Socialist overthrow—the Capitalist system?"

Trades unions become corrupt because they are impotent. Strike victories are woefully scarce, and when they do occur, the victorious (t) wage slave can well exclaim, as did Pyrrhus, "Another such victory, and I am undone." If the above were not facts, then the Socialist Labor Party would be useless.

As to the Proposed Amendment of Section Everett.

After having read the criticism of Comrade Karl Koechlin on Section Everett's proposition to amend the constitution, I consider it my duty to answer same, as a member of Section Everett at the time of its adoption by that Section.

Comrade Koechlin asks "Is it possible that clear-headed Socialists can ever think that the economic power wielded by the trades organizations is a naught to the Socialist propaganda," etc. I now ask the comrades "Is it possible for a clear-headed, etc. Socialist to think other than that they have proven themselves worse than a naught to the Socialist propaganda, in other words towards the Socialist overthrow—the Capitalist system?"

Trades unions become corrupt because they are impotent. Strike victories are woefully scarce, and when they do occur, the victorious (t) wage slave can well exclaim, as did Pyrrhus, "Another such victory, and I am undone." If the above were not facts, then the Socialist Labor Party would be useless.

As to the Proposed Amendment of Section Everett.

Comrade Koechlin and others make a great mistake when they assume that economic conditions and economic organizations are one and the same. Political conditions or "power" are a result of economic conditions, not economic organizations. All economic organizations of the wage-working class are a result of the unconscious state of their members; for it is impossible, and as such, useless to check the capitalist system. Capitalism can only be overthrown. The question before us is Socialism or Capitalism. In other words "Reform or Revolution." Political conditions reflect and control economic conditions.

We condemn the Army-building Social Democracy for "using molasses to catch flies." Are we not doing the same with the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance? In other words we are trying to use the S. T. & L. A. as a means of "catching" those unconscious members of the wage-working class, who still retain the worn-out notions of strike, etc. Do we need a trades union to teach us our class interests. If so the Socialist Labor Party is superfluous, and should go down and out.

I advise Comrade Koechlin and others to cease their abuse of Section Everett and study the question. And now, comrades, it is a duty we owe to the wage-working class, ourselves included, to repair this mistake and stand out firm as a Revolutionary Socialist organization.

Abram Miller.

Malden, Mass., July 1.

II.

Newark, N. J., July, 63.

To the Members of the Socialist Party—Comrades: We, the undersigned members of Section Essex County, N. J., S. L. P., desire to inform you that we endorsed the Everett amendments and shall vote for the same, for a number of reasons, a few of which are as follows:

1. If Socialism stands for anything, it stands for the complete overthrow of capitalism.

2. Economic organizations are in their life and essence craft and graft organizations and, as such, ever will retard the progress of Socialism.

3. In the light of our present economic evolution, with the capitalist judiciary making it a crime to organize for economic defence, to strike or boycott, there is no refuge but the S. L. P. Energy expended in other directions is worse than wasted.

The issue is clear. By the adoption of the Everett amendments the S. L. P. springs into the arena unhampered, freed from all petty squabbles and bourgeois issues. Yours for Socialism.

Section Essex County, N. J.

June 9, 1903.

Andrew P. Willet, Secretary.

Frank C. Burghof, Organizer.

III.

To the Members of the S. L. P.—Section Everett, Massachusetts, in proposing a severance of connection between the S. L. P. and S. T. & L. A., declares that an economic organization of labor is necessarily a reform organization. Section Everett must have had the pure and simple union in mind and confused that with the S. T. & L. A. If the members of Section Everett will read the manifesto of the S. T. & L. A., and point out anything therein that it is a reform movement, then their proposition for the party to sever connection with the S. T. & L. A. would contain some logic.

The S. T. & L. A. declares in unequivocal terms that the war against capitalism must be carried on simultaneously on the political and economic field. It points out clearly that there can be no harmony between the capitalist and the laborer, and calls upon the workers to not only fight for better conditions every day in the mine, mill and factory, but to proceed class-consciously to the polls on election day; and, with the ballot of the S. L. P., put an end to the wage system by making the machinery of production public property.

Section Everett may call that reform, but Section St. Louis calls it revolution.

The pure and simple union declares that the union card is the badge of labor solidarity. The S. T. & L. A. declares that no union card will justify the political scab.

—Is that reform?

Section St. Louis being composed of men who are directly engaged every day of their lives in fighting the capitalist in the shop and factory know by experience the thousand and one impositions tried upon the workers by the superintendents, managers and foremen, hired by the capitalist to do the practical work of exploiting the rank and file of the workers in the slave pens, and, consequently, know the necessity of economic organization to resist these impositions. Therefore, it is resolved by the members of Section St. Louis, in mass-meeting assembled, that the following should be and is the opinion of this Section on the question of severing connection with the economic organization of labor as represented by the S. T. & L. A.:

"Whereas, The forces which must be depended upon for the revolution are to be recruited from the mine, mill and factory, where wages the daily class struggle which forces the workers to form economic organizations; therefore, the Socialist Labor Party, being the political organization of labor, designed to lead the workers to the accomplishment of the revolution, cannot, without stultifying itself, sever its connection with the economic organization of labor.

